















# CONTENTS

OF

Nº. XLVI.

PAGE.

- ART. I. The Life and Times of the Rev. George Whitefield,  
M.A. By Robert Philip ..... 265
- II. 1. The Primitive Doctrine of Election ; or an Historical  
Inquiry into the Ideality and Causation of Scriptural  
Election, as received and maintained in the Primi-  
tive Church of Christ. By G. S. Faber, B.D.
2. The Doctrine of Election, and its Connection with  
the general Tenor of Christianity, illustrated from  
many parts of Scripture, and especially from the  
Epistle to the Romans. By Thomas Erskine, Esq. 299
- III. 1. The 51st Report of the Society for the Support and  
Encouragement of Sunday Schools throughout the  
British Dominions.
2. The 34th Annual Report of the Sunday School Union.
3. The 32d Report of British and Foreign School Society.
4. The 26th Report of the National Society for promot-  
ing the Education of the Poor.
5. The 1st Annual Report of the Home and Colonial  
Infant School Society.
6. The 1st Publication of the Central Society of Educa-  
tion, 1837 ; and Schools for the Industrious Classes,  
or the Present State of Education among the Working  
People of England ..... 329
- IV. 1. The Study of Morals vindicated and recommended,  
in a Sermon preached before the University of Ox-  
ford. By Henry Arthur Woodgate, B.D.
2. The Law of the Mind and the Law of the Members,  
a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford,  
with Notes and an Appendix. By Charles Henry  
Craufurd, M.A.
3. On the Foundations of Morals. Four Sermons  
preached before the University of Cambridge, No-  
vember, 1837. By Rev. William Whewell.
4. The Dangers and Safeguards of Ethical Science: the  
Inaugural Lecture of the Rev. W. Sewell, M.A.
5. Remarks upon the Aristotelian and Platonic Ethics,  
as a branch of the Studies pursued in the University  
of Oxford. By Rev. Frederick Oakeley, M.A..... 376

ART. V. 1. Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. (Intended to complete the Works of Shuckford and Prideaux.) By Rev. Michael Russell, D.D.	
2. Histoire des Juifs dans le Moyen Age.....	396
VI. M. Cousin's Report on the State of Education in Holland. Translated by Mr. Horner .....	439
VII. 1. Draft of a Fifth Report of the Commissioners appointed to consider the State of the Established Church in England and Wales, with reference to Ecclesiastical Revenues; also the Correspondence thereon. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 22d December, 1837.	
2. Chapter and Collegiate Memorials, addressed to the Church Commissioners in 1836 and 1837.	
3. A Letter on the Augmentation of a particular Class of Poor Livings, &c. By the Earl of Harrowby.	
4. A Bill to abridge the holding of Benefices in Plurality, &c. Printed 23d December, 1837.	
5. The Ecclesiastical Commission and the Universities. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D.	
6. Some Observations on the tendency of a Measure for the future Regulation of Cathedral and Collegiate Bodies, &c. By J. H. Spry, D.D.	
7. The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission examined, &c. By H. E. Manning, M.A.	
8. The Correspondence between the Ecclesiastical Commission and the Bishop of Ely.	
9. A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham. By C. Thorp, D.D.	
10. The Prebendary, or Cathedral Establishment; being the Substance of Letters in the Morning Herald. Part I.	
11. Are Cathedral Institutions useless? a Practical Answer to this Question.	
12. On the Proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission, &c. By C. Benson, M.A.	
13. Reduction of Prebendaries. By F. A. Glover, M.A.	
14. Observations on the Illegal and Unconstitutional Character of the Ecclesiastical Commission. By a Layman.	
15. "Continuing daily with one accord in the Temple." A Sermon on the Daily Service of the Church, &c. By the Very Rev. George Chandler, D.C.L. ....	455
NOTICES OF BOOKS .....	569

THE  
BRITISH CRITIC,  
AND  
Quarterly Theological Review.

---

APRIL, 1838.

---

ART. I.—*The Life and Times of the Rev. George Whitefield, M. A.* By Robert Philip. London: Virtue, 1837. 8vo.

WE are told by Mr. Philip, in his preface, that the time is not yet come, for the *philosophy* of Whitefield's life; but that, nevertheless, it is fast approaching; and that, consequently, his mass of facts will soon be turned to good account, by himself, or by some one else. In the course of his work, however, the author suggests that the collection of *facts* will never be complete, until there shall appear an *American*, as well as an *English* biography, of this extraordinary man: America having been one of the grand *observatories* from which the phenomena of the erratic luminary might be most distinctly seen, and most accurately examined.

Now, with regard to the *philosophy* of Whitefield's life, we have to remark that the phrase is one which conveys to us little but hazy and indistinct conceptions. It is possible, however, that the writer has here identified, in his own mind, the mighty itinerant himself with the cause of which he was so striking a representative; and that, by the *philosophy* of Whitefield's life, he means neither more nor less than a profound and masterly disquisition into the concentration of those *nebulous* elements, which had long been floating abroad in the firmament of our Reformation; and which, gradually gathering substance, appeared at last in the portentous forms of Wesley, and of Whitefield. We collect something like this, from a sort of promise, held out by Mr. Philip, that if "the honest *Catholicity* of his present work should commend it, it may be followed by *Annals and Illustrations of "Evangelical Preaching*, from the dawn of the Reformation, to "the close of the present century." In other words—unless we greatly misapprehend him—the author proposes to himself the honour of achieving that high *philosophy*, which is to solve all the phenomena, not only of the life and character of Whitefield, but of those complex movements and workings which had their con-

summation, in *his* appearance, and in that of his marvellous colleague in the process of religious *agitation*.

If such be, in truth, his ambition, he may be assured that he will have before him a task worthy of the very loftiest powers: a task, which demands the amplest range of reading, the deepest resources of thought, the profoundest knowledge of human nature, the most dispassionate judgment, and the calmest and most charitable temper. He will have to *sound* the deep things of that spirit, which had long been brooding over the abyss of superstition and corruption, till the fountains were broken up, and the deluge went over many a fair province of Christendom, and threatened, for a time, to overwhelm temple, and tower, and pinnacle, in one wide-wasting desolation. And then he will have to watch the subsiding of the waters, and the gradual re-appearance of many a lofty fabric, which had massive strength and solidity enough to stand in the midst of the fury of that inundation. He will have to point, with exultation, to the wrecks and fragments of those perishable works of human hands, which had grown up about the walls of the city of God, and had disfigured it, and made it almost a spectacle of scorn to men and angels. And, alas! "if there be nature in him," he will look, with ruth and pity, on the yawning and deadly breaches, which, here and there, have been made in the fortresses of Zion, by the blind and indiscriminate rage of the great convulsion. If these be the views with which he, or any other man, shall approach this grand and sacred work, then may that man righteously win for himself the praise and honour of true Christian *philosophy*. But if, on the contrary, his eye shall wander over the scene of strife and confusion, only to feed itself with the spectacle of destruction,—if the chiefest of his joy shall be, to behold the wild licence of human opinion rising upon the ruins of Pontifical supremacy,—if, in short, his love for the Reformation shall be found to involve a mortal hatred for almost every thing which was known to exist before the Reformation,—then, doubtless, he may achieve a name to be wise, among them that can scarcely be said to live, but in the midst of unceasing change and instability. But, as certainly, he will deceive himself in the hope of building up the immortal fame of a *philosopher*.

For ourselves, we scruple not to declare that our poor philosophy is confounded and overborne by the bewildering rush of strange events, which have followed in the train of the great moral revolution of the 16th century. That this revolution has wrought most mightily for good, it would be ungrateful—nay, it would be sinful—to deny. And yet, we can scarcely question that a costly, and, in some respects, a truly awful price, has been exacted

for the benefits bestowed. The crisis appears to have well nigh shaken to pieces the unity and the compactness which *we* of the Anglican school have been in the habits of contemplating as one majestic attribute of the Holy Catholic Church. And this is a spectacle which we confess ourselves unable to look upon, without emotions of dismay and amazement. To us, the Scriptures of truth,—as interpreted and illustrated by the earliest history of our faith,—present the one and indivisible community of Christians, under one unvarying rule and discipline, as the grand instrument for displaying to the world the manifold wisdom and mercy of God. And yet, the season of the Church's deliverance from tyranny and imposture, appears likewise to have been the season for letting loose upon Christendom a spirit of almost universal disunion and anarchy. Then it was that the evil power of schism began to sow the wind; and fearful is the harvest which, at this hour, we are left to gather in! It would be a task too mighty for our limits,—perhaps too mighty for our strength,—to trace the causes which, by a long and labyrinthine process, have brought on a state of things apparently so much at variance with the declared counsels of God. In the midst, however, of all our melancholy searchings of heart, it best becomes us to derive from the mournful history such lessons of submission and of faith, as may keep us stedfast and unmoveable in the midst of these mysterious and perplexing dispensations. And, one consideration there is, which furnishes abundant cause, at once for humiliation, and for comfort; namely, that albeit we are forbidden to deal loosely or unfaithfully with the commandments of the Lord, yet the Lord is by no means tied and bound to the ordinances which He hath, Himself, proclaimed. It is, in truth, a saddening thing to behold the Church of this land, at any time, so languid in zeal,—so mutilated in authority, and power, and resources,—so overwhelmed by the influx of a population which had rapidly outgrown her strength,—as scarcely to be fit for the discharge of her sacred responsibilities. And yet, we fear it must be allowed that something like this was the actual condition of our Church, towards the commencement of the last century. And, herein we have abundant cause for humiliation, deep and sore. On the other hand it would really seem as if it were the Lord's pleasure to raise up good out of the fierce and lowering evil of the times—to cause the spirit of schism itself to arise and drive away the spirit of slumber which had long been descending upon the Church—to drain off, by two mighty channels, the waters of strife which were flooding the wilderness and the morass that lay beyond her means and opportunities of cultivation,—and to send forth the torrents with a cleansing and healthful effect into the midst of

the foul impurities which had been there accumulating for many a generation. And, if this were so, we, doubtless, should have reason for thankfulness and comfort. It would, indeed, be little less than madness in us to declare it an indifferent matter whether God's ark be handled by them who hold his express commission, or by them who deem any such commission to be a matter of doubtful disputation, or, perhaps, little better than a nullity. But, if it should appear to be God's will, in the exercise of his inscrutable sovereignty, in any degree to own and prosper ministrations, wilfully undertaken, and irregularly conducted,—it would surely be to fight against God, if we were to close our eyes to whatever good those ministrations might accomplish. It would rather befit us, in the spirit of humility, to search into the causes of displeasure, which had given over to another a part of the honour and reward ordained for a true, a faithful, and a laborious Church. And this train of reflection and of feeling might powerfully impress upon us a sense of our own personal unworthiness, without abating one jot of our confidence in the high and righteous claims of that Apostolic ministry, to which our clergy have been called.

At all events, we vastly prefer this sort of cautious and charitable *philosophy*, to the temper which vents itself in loud and *railing accusations* against the enthusiasm and fanaticism of the age, whenever an impetuous zeal “shoots madly from its sphere,” into some wild and eccentric trajectory of its own. We would do nothing to sanction or encourage such perilous deviations from what we believe to be the legitimate course of action. But if God sees fit to allow such violations of order,—if at any time the tide of circumstances should run so furiously as to overflow both dyke and channel,—our wisdom surely is to acquiesce in these indications of His Providence; and gratefully to recognize whatever symptoms of fertility the deluge may have left behind it. And,—with this general exposition of our views and feelings,—we proceed at once to the biography of George Whitefield, prepared for us by Mr. Philip, as he assures us, chiefly from the pen of Whitefield himself.

It appears, then, that the parents of this truly wonderful man kept the Bell Inn at Gloucester, where he was born in December, 1714; a circumstance which, he tells us, strongly excited him, in after life, to follow the example of his Saviour, who was born in the manger of a common hostelry. Like many other men of distinguished piety, he declares that the stirrings of corruption manifested themselves early in his heart. Instruction he hated. Lying, filthy talking, and foolish jesting, he was egregiously addicted to, even when very young. Stealing from his mother he thought no



theft at all, and made no scruple of taking money from her pockets before she was up. Plays, cards, and romances were his heart's delight. In short, it would be endless to recount the sins and offences of his younger days. The young man in the Gospel might declare that he had kept the commandments from his *youth up*: but, for *his* part, he confesses that, from *his* youth he had broken them all; so that, if he traced himself from his cradle to his manhood, he could see nothing in himself, but a fitness to be damned. Such, however, was the free grace of God towards him, that, in spite of the workings of corruption, he could recollect, very early, certain movings of the blessed Spirit upon his heart. Of this, he gives one very curious instance. When certain persons diverted themselves with teasing him, he immediately retired to his room; and, kneeling down, with many tears, prayed over the 118th psalm. Now it so happens that the 118th psalm is, through a considerable portion of it, sternly imprecatory. It would seem, therefore, as if the angry boy believed himself divinely moved to assuage his irritated feelings, by a vindictive application of sacred language. Surely, he can have known but little what spirit he was of, when he launched at the heads of his vexatious and teasing comrades the thunders of the awful text,—*they kept me in on every side; they compassed me about like bees; they are quenched as the fire of thorns; but, in the name of the Lord, I will destroy them!*

At this time, Whitefield was only ten years old. But, even at this early period, he was always fond of *enacting* the clergyman; and frequently used to imitate the clerical function in reading prayers, &c. He, nevertheless, remained still much addicted to petty thefts; but he silenced or bribed his conscience by giving part of his plunder to the poor, and by fixing upon books of devotion as objects of his larcenous propensities,—for which, however, he assures us that he afterwards restored *fourfold*. At the age of twelve he was placed at a school called St. Mary de Crypt, in Gloucester. And here his powers of elocution, and strength of memory, marked him out as a fit person to make speeches before the corporation, at their annual visitation. And here, too, his taste for theatrical compositions and amusements acquired additional keenness. It was not till he went to college that he was *suddenly* extricated from the snares of this sinful folly. God, upon a fast-day, was pleased to convince him. Taking up a play, to read a passage to a friend, God struck his heart with such power, that he was obliged to lay it down again.

At about the age of fifteen, his mother's circumstances being much on the decline, he began occasionally to assist her in the occupations of the public-house; till, at length, he put on his blue

apron,—washed mops,—cleaned rooms,—and became, in one word, the professed and common *drawer* of the Bell Inn, for nearly a year and a half. From this sordid and miserable servitude, however, he at last withdrew himself, and went on a visit to his elder brother, at Bristol, where he remained for two months. This, it appears, was a season of perpetual conflict between internal convictions, and the vanities of the world. He read Thomas a Kempis. He frequented the Lord's House. But, being without stated and needful employment, Satan seized on the opportunity to tempt and buffet him. Much of his time was still passed in reading plays, and sauntering about. He became solicitous to adorn his body, but altogether careless of beautifying his soul. Soon after this, he got acquainted with a set of debauched, abandoned, and atheistical youths,—took pleasure in their lewd conversation,—affected to look rakish,—and was in a fair way of being as infamous as the rest of them. If he went to public service, it was only to make sport and walk about. God, however, stopped him, when running on in a full career of vice, by giving him an unconquerable disgust for the habits and practices of his companions. This was followed by serious symptoms of reformation. He read Drelincourt “upon Death,”—went to public worship twice a-day,—and diligently studied the Greek Testament; but, nevertheless, remained unconvinced of the absolute unlawfulness of cards and plays. At last, he dreamed that he was to see God on Mount Sinai, but was afraid to meet him. The impression made by this dream was, doubtless, much strengthened by the exclamation of a gentlewoman to whom he told it,—“*George, this is a call from God.*” Thenceforward he grew more serious: but yet, hypocrisy crept into every action; and, as he once affected to look rakish, so now, he strove to look more grave than he really was. Nevertheless, in the midst of all these strivings between flesh and spirit, he was seized with an unaccountable but deep impression, that he should speedily become a preacher.

At the age of eighteen, by the assistance of some kind friends, he was entered, as a servitor, at Pembroke College, Oxford. And this event affords to Mr. Philip an opportunity of writing many bitter things, relative to the state of religion in the University, at that period; which, as our object is not controversy, we deem it best to pass over with transient notice. It is, however, worthy of remark that the Wesleys, and their associates, fare but little better, in his hands, than the men of “robes and forms.” “For any relief”—he says—“which the consciences of the “Wesleyans seem to have obtained from the death of the Son of “God, and the free salvation proclaimed in virtue of it, the Gos-

“pel might have been altogether untrue, or unknown. So “grossly ignorant were the whole band, at one time.—They “were *monks* in almost every thing but the name.” Whitefield, however, being then in a state of spiritual immaturity, felt his heart yearn towards the Methodists. He soon became acquainted with Charles Wesley, who put into his hands a book entitled “The Life of God in the Soul of Man.” And if—says his biographer—he had been left to the guidance of that book, his foot might soon have stood upon the rock of ages. But, unhappily, Whitefield was not left to follow his own convictions. Charles Wesley, as Mr. Philip assures us, being *ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish his own righteousness*, interfered with the young convert, and inoculated him with the *virus* of legality and quietism. His introduction to this school proved well nigh fatal to his life and reason. It drove him to a course of the most savage austerities. He wore woollen gloves, a patched gown, and dirty shoes. In imitation of Jesus Christ, who was carried into the haunts of wild beasts, during his temptation, he passed several hours of a stormy night in Christ Church Walk, sometimes kneeling, sometimes flat on his face. The severity of his fasts was perfectly appalling. Except on Saturdays and Sundays, he took nothing but coarse bread, and sage-tea, without sugar; and he walked out in the cold until part of one of his hands became quite black. And, in these practices he persisted, till he was scarcely able to creep up stairs. In the mean while, his principal study was Castanza’s “Spiritual Combat;” and, as it would appear, with Satan himself for its interpreter! When Castanza said *talk but little*, Satan said *talk not at all*. When Castanza advised waiting upon God, Satan told him he must leave all forms, and utterly abstain from lifting up his voice in prayer. His tutor concluded that he must be really mad: but, nevertheless, was the only person about him who treated him with real benignity and wisdom. Charles Wesley sent him to Thomas a Kempis. John Wesley referred him to the sovereign balm of quietism. His tutor lent him books, gave him money, furnished him with a physician, and behaved to him, in all respects, like a father.

But the hour of deliverance was now at hand. The remembrance of his sins began to assail him so furiously, that it drove him from Castanza and A Kempis direct to the Gospel and the throne of grace. While thus engaged in searching the Scriptures, with the aid of Bishop Hall’s Contemplations, he discovered the true grounds of a sinner’s hope and justification. The testimony of God concerning his Son, became *power unto salvation*. He immediately felt delivered from his burden. The spirit of heavi-

ness was taken from him. Such was his joy, that he could not avoid singing psalms, wherever he might be. The days of his mourning were ended; and the day-star arose in his heart. And thus was Whitefield rescued—as his biographer phrases it—“from the malignant snares of the devil;” in other words, from the Methodism of the Wesleyans, “whose virtues”—he tells us—“at that time, ranked no higher than the same virtues in Mahomedans and Hindoos; and amounted to no more at Oxford, than they would at Mecca or Benares.” “If”—continues Mr. Philip—“the same number of Wahabees had been about Whitefield, inculcating their simplified Islamism, who would have ascribed to them, or to it, any usefulness? Both would have been arraigned, as diverting him from the Gospel of Christ: nor would the sincerity of the Wahabees, or the self-denying character of their habits, have shielded either from severe reprehension.”

Leaving the Wesleyans and Mr. Philip to settle with each other, touching this rather unceremonious denunciation, we proceed with the narrative. Being now thoroughly enlightened as to the necessity of being justified in the sight of God, by faith only, he, in a short time, began to read to some poor people twice or thrice a week—to attend little religious societies—and to visit one or two sick persons every day. He was, further, strengthened to give a public testimony of his repentance, as to the abomination of his theatrical propensities. For, hearing that the strollers were come into the town—he was then at Gloucester—he was stirred up to an assault upon their craft; which he conducted in the form of a series of attacks in the newspaper. The thunder which he used, was Law's Treatise on the “Absolute Unlawfulness of Stage Entertainments;” which the printer consented to launch forth, in separate and successive explosions, for six weeks together. By this time, his friends became clamorous for his ordination. Whitefield, however, was vehemently reluctant. With strong crying and tears, he frequently prayed,—“Lord, I am a youth of uncircumcised lips. Lord, send me not “into thy vineyard yet.” But, at length, after much internal conflict, and some external difficulties, he resolved no longer to fight against God; and, on the 20th June, 1736, he was ordained at Gloucester, by Bishop Benson, being then in the twenty-second year of his age. And thus it was, that this wandering star, which was destined to fix the gaze of European and Transatlantic Christendom, for a long series of years, was seen to issue forth from the serene and peaceful sanctuary of the Anglican Church. It appears, however, that Whitefield did not, afterwards, look back with much complacency upon this commencement of his

ministry. "It is not generally known"—says Mr. Philip—"that, although he never lost sight of his ordination vows, his views of episcopal ordination underwent such a change, that he declared to Ralph Erskine, of his own accord,—*I knew no other way, then; but I would not have it that way again, for a thousand worlds.*" From which we may collect that, if Whitefield kept his ordination vows in mind, he did so with much the same feeling that a man remembers a promise which he is resolved *not* to fulfil. His canonical engagements were a yoke which he was unable to endure; but, from which it was impossible for him forcibly to withdraw his neck, without a certain uncomfortable sense of excoiation.

No sooner was Whitefield in orders, than his passion for a locomotive and missionary course of enterprize was irresistibly called forth, by a cry for help from the other side of the Atlantic. Letters were received, about that time, from the Wesleys, then in Georgia. Their description of the moral condition of the American colonies awakened a fire within his bones, which would not suffer him to rest. He had various opportunities of clerical occupation. But, the moment the voice from Georgia reached his ears, to borrow the language of Mr. Philip, "Oxford had no magnet, Hampshire no charms, the metropolis no fascination for the young evangelist." That Whitefield did not go forth as an intruder upon the sphere of the Wesleys, appears, pretty clearly, from the following extract of a letter from John Wesley;—"only Mr. Delamotte is with me, until God shall stir up the hearts of his servants to come over and help us. What if thou art the man, Mr. Whitefield? Do you ask me what you shall have? Food to eat, and raiment to put on; a house to lay your head in, such as your Lord had not; and a crown of glory that fadeth not away." A more intelligible invitation than this, it would be difficult to imagine: and "the heart of Whitefield leaped within him, and, as it were, echoed to the call." In vain did his aged mother weep. In vain did his officious friends talk of the "pretty preferment" he might have, if he would stay at home. He was fortified in his resolution by his own prayers; and, moreover, by the opinion of the Bishop, who expressed his entire confidence that God would enable him to do much good *abroad*.

It was now that the prodigious powers of Whitefield, as a preacher, began to manifest themselves. His farewell sermons at Gloucester and Bristol operated with a sort of electrical force. Churches were filled on week-days as they used to be on Sundays; and, on Sundays, they were so thronged, that numbers were compelled to retire for want of room. "The word was sharper than

"a two-edged sword. The doctrine of the *new birth* made its way, like lightning, into the consciences of the hearers." In fact, let the peculiar doctrine have been what it might, there was, in these addresses, an intensity of spirit, an affectionate urgency of appeal, which must have wrought, at that time, with much of the influence of novelty; and, when combined with Whitefield's transcendent powers of utterance and delivery, were, of themselves, sufficient to account for much of the tumultuous agitation which ensued. It was seldom, for instance, in those days, that congregations were seized upon, and drawn upwards, by words like these: "Come, come, my guilty brethren. I beseech you, for your immortal souls' sake, for Christ's sake, come to Christ. Methinks I could speak till midnight unto you. I am full of love towards you. Would you have me go, and tell my Master, that you will not come, and that I have spent my strength in vain? I cannot bear to carry such a message to him! I would not, indeed I would not, be a swift witness against you, at the great day of account. But, if you will refuse these gracious invitations, I must do it!" This was a tremendous, and yet a most heart-moving strain, to issue from the lips of one who was, himself, but dust and ashes,—from one, too, who as yet was but a mere youth. The people must have imagined, for the moment, that they saw before them a heavenly messenger of wrath, or love, who felt secure as to his own doom, and was solicitous only for theirs.

Previously to his embarkation, Whitefield passed some time in London. His ministry there began at the Tower. He "fulmined o'er the arsenal." And God, he says, was pleased to give him favour amongst its inhabitants. Religious friends, from various "parts of the town, attended the word; and several young men, on the Lord's day, under serious impressions, came to converse with him on the new birth." At this time, however, Whitefield does not appear to have contemplated London as a principal sphere of exertion. On the contrary, as Mr. Philip expresses it, the metropolis then was to him merely the way to America. He sought no engagements, and volunteered no services. But his fame had travelled before him. He was beset by solicitations to preach, especially when religious or charitable funds stood in need of reinforcement; and the moral effect, as usual, was prodigious; and, what perhaps was equally gratifying to stewards and trustees, the collections were wholly unprecedented. But popularity soon brought opposition in its train. A report was spread that the Bishop of London intended to silence him on a complaint of the clergy. What the Bishop might have done had Whitefield, at that time, commenced his

career of what Mr. Philip calls his "splendid irregularities," it would be utterly useless to conjecture. As it was, when it was understood that Georgia was to be the scene of his missionary labours, his lordship made no objection to that destination of himself, and gave him "a satisfactory answer;" upon which he took his leave. During the interval before his departure, in spite of all resistance, he found abundance of pulpits open to him; and "at length," he tells us, "having preached in a good part of the London churches, collected 1000*l.* for the charity schools, and got 300*l.* for the poor in Georgia, I left London on December 28th, 1737, in the twenty-third year of my age; and went, in the strength of God, as a poor pilgrim on board the Whitaker."

And well, it must be allowed, did the "poor pilgrim" perform his part during the passage. The voyage was perilous and distressing. And, throughout it, Whitefield was the minister of comfort to the sufferers. When the sea was rough, he went from hammock to hammock among the sea-sick, "administering sage tea and good advice." When many of the soldiers on board were taken ill, Whitefield became the nurse of his "red-coated parishioners," as he called them. During the prevalence of a fever he crawled between decks, to administer medicine and cordials to the sailors. That his attention to the spiritual concerns of his fellow voyagers was equally unwearied, is obvious from the result of his ministrations. When first he went on board he was treated as an impostor, and, in order to mark the contempt in which he was held, the vessel was turned into a gambling-house, during the first Sabbath; but, before the voyage was ended, the ship was as orderly as a church. The drum summoned to morning and evening prayers. Cards, and profane books were thrown overboard in exchange for religious books. The soldiers began to learn to read and write, and the children to repeat their prayers regularly. His farewell sermon to his "red-coated and blue-jacketed parishioners" was heard with "floods of tears;" and the passage to Georgia was, in after years, looked back upon by Whitefield as one of the brightest intervals of his life.

Early in May, Whitefield reached America; where, in spite of Wesley's formidable *sortilegium*, (dissuading him from the voyage, and declaring it to be the counsel of God that he should return to London,) he passed some months in *labours of love*, which met with the most gladdening encouragement, and so attached him to his "little foreign cure," that he could cheerfully have remained among them. It was, however, needful that he should return to London, in order to receive priest's orders, and, moreover, to collect contributions for the establishment and mainte-

nance of an Orphan House in the colony. And here we find ourselves suddenly launched forth upon the ocean of his "splendid irregularities"—his brave neglect of ecclesiastical discipline and order,—the illustrious reproach (καλλίστον ὄνειδος), as he deemed it, of his whole future life. It would be idle for us to attempt any abstract of a tale which has been often and copiously told before. The materials are so various and abundant as to defy abridgement. We must, therefore, satisfy ourselves with such desultory remarks as are peculiarly suggested by the narrative now before us.

The impetuous and incessant movements of Whitefield's life appear, throughout, to have been governed by a marvellous simplicity of purpose. He organized no system. He was little solicitous to collect and discipline a band of auxiliaries and followers. He went forth on an almost solitary career of errant spiritual chivalry. He saw before him a frightful mass of vice, brutality, and ungodliness; and he sallied out upon a warfare against it, with the might of his own single arm; that arm, as he profoundly believed, being nerved for the conflict by the might of the living God. He entered into no historical or philosophical speculations, relative to the process by which all the evil he beheld had been heaped up. He cast forward no looks of anxious foresight to the exigencies of the future. The past was beyond human power. The future might be fitly trusted to the providence of the Almighty. The present was his sphere, not only of action, but of thought. The portentous mischiefs of the time perpetually stared him in the face; and he resolved to grapple with the monsters. This, with him, was the one thing needful. His heart was tender and benevolent. His temperament was full of fire. He became gradually conscious of a commanding influence over assembled multitudes. And, thus accomplished, he was prepared for an assault upon the gates of hell itself. His own deliverance was, in his judgment, little less than a stupendous miracle. We have seen that he could discern, in his own nature, nothing but a fitness to be damned; and yet he found himself, almost on a sudden, in possession of the peace which passeth understanding. He has repeatedly affirmed that, by natural constitution, he was an abject coward; and yet, in the cause of God, he felt himself, if we may so express it, quite *saturated* with courage; thoroughly instinct with the fortitude which bids defiance to the embattled hosts of darkness. Why then, should not the same Potentate, who had plucked the sinner from the burning, and ordained strength out of the mouth of one who was timid as a child—why should not He convert the *reed shaken by the wind* into a mighty weapon, keener than a two-edged sword? The



mercies he had experienced himself, he was impatient to see extended to others; and, not only so, but to be honoured as the channel of that communication. Freely he had received, and freely he was resolved to give. This was the overpowering impulse which seems to have sent him forth to the streets and lanes, to the highways and the hedges; and, to him, that impulse was as a call from heaven. In comparison with this, what were the authority, the discipline, the canons of a church? Or what was the glory of being immortalized as the founder of a sect? His was a *roving* commission for the salvation of human souls; a work which spurns at the thought of parties, or monopolies. In his own estimation, *he* was the truest of all *Catholics*; for his ambition to seek and save that which was lost, knew no limits, save those of the habitable world. And, in this spirit it was, that he passed his life in compassing both sea and land.

That this was the general tenor of his feelings and his meditations appears clearly enough from his conference at Edinburgh with the Associate Presbytery of Seceders, in 1741; of which he himself has left us a most interesting account. These men, we are told, were exceedingly desirous to have Whitefield all to themselves. They even refused to hear him preach, unless he would agree to join, exclusively, with them. In furtherance of their views, they were for proceeding to set him right about the matter of church government, and the Solemn League and Covenant. He replied, that they might save themselves that trouble; for he had no scruples about the matter; and as for preaching about the Solemn League and Covenant, it formed no part of his plan. When they reminded him that he was born and bred in England, which had revolted most with respect to church government, and that, therefore, he could not possibly be acquainted with the subject in debate;—he said, that he had never made the Solemn League and Covenant the object of his study, being too busy about matters which he judged to be of far greater importance. In vain was it urged, that every pin of the Tabernacle is precious. The effect of this allegation upon the mind of Whitefield was like that of the thistle-down against the tempest. He said that, in every building, there were *outside* and *inside* workmen; that the latter, at present, was his province; that if they thought themselves called to the former, they might proceed in their own way, and he should proceed in his. He then asked them, seriously, what they would have him do? The answer was, that he was not desired to subscribe immediately to the Solemn League and Covenant, but to preach only for *them*, till he had further light; and the reason given for this demand was, that “they were the “Lord’s people.” The reply of Whitefield to this opens a dis-

tinged apocalypse of his mind. He asked whether there were no other Lord's people but themselves? and, supposing all others were the devil's people, they certainly had more need to be preached to; and, therefore, he was the more determined to go out into the highways and hedges; and that if the Pope himself would lend him his pulpit, he would gladly proclaim the righteousness of Jesus Christ therein. The consequence of all this was an open breach with the Associate Presbytery; and the triumphant admission of Whitefield to the pulpits of the Kirk. For the triumph, however, he cared nothing. "He forgot equally," says Mr. Philip, "the joy of the Kirk, and the mortification of the Chapel, in seeking the triumphs of the Cross. While Churchmen were pluming themselves upon their gain, and Seceders trying to despise their loss, he was singing, with Paul, 'Now, thanks be unto God, who always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest, by us, the savour of his knowledge, in every place.'"

It is manifest that at this time, if the conference had been with a synod of Church of England divines, instead of a company of Scottish schismatics, he would have been ready with replies analogous to the above, if pressed with his extravagant departures from the order and discipline of the Anglican communion. He was an *inside workman*; and, therefore, far beyond the censure or controul of men who were chiefly occupied in guarding and upholding the *outside* of the building. It is true that he took his orders from the Church; and, moreover, that he continued for a time to profess his adherence to her communion. In token of this fidelity, he once went to St. Paul's with the Fetter Lane Society, to receive the sacrament. But this was, not very unreasonably, regarded as a strange sort of *adherence*, when he went from St. Paul's to Moor Fields and Kennington Common, and preached to 30,000 people! There is little doubt, we apprehend, that Whitefield's allegiance to the Church might have remained unshaken and unimpaired to the last, provided the Church would, or could, have done for him, what the Popes did for the itinerant and mendicant fraternities. Had she invested him with an exemption from episcopal controul, and an unlimited licence to intrude into the ministries of the parochial clergy, and a privilege to pray and preach when and where he would, in church or chapel, in house, or barn, or open field, he would, probably, have been as faithfully devoted to the Establishment, as the begging orders were to the Vatican. He would then have combined the advantages of ecclesiastical authority, with those of an almost unbounded liberty of action. It is obvious, for many reasons, that the Church could allow him no such amplitude of discretion. For

although her discipline has fallen into feebleness and desuetude, so that it is often difficult for her to assert her own authority, yet it would be strange, indeed, if she were to proclaim her own rules and ordinances a nullity, whenever a fiery spirit in her communion might become impatient of canonical restraint. She might find it no easy matter to visit an extravagant and irregular minister like Whitefield with any effectual interdict. And yet it is hardly to be expected that she should set much value on his professions of adherence. In this state of things, it was easy enough for Whitefield to proclaim himself an adherent to the Church, and to appeal to his readiness to preach, or pray, or communicate, in any of her consecrated fabrics. But, it is manifest that, when once he had rushed headlong into his career of magnificent eccentricity, all canonical obligations became, to him, as tow when it toucheth the fire. He was, then, an adherent of the Church, much in the same sense that he was an adherent of any sect or denomination which might be content to receive him among them, whenever he chose to come. His allegiance, in fact, amounted to neither more nor less than mere occasional conformity.

His notions of fidelity to the Church may be duly estimated from the following circumstance. At one of the associations in Wales, a motion was made, in the presence of Whitefield, for an open separation from the Establishment. He was exceedingly disturbed and grieved at the proposal; which he denounced as the work of "a few contracted spirits." By far the greater part, however, combined with him in strenuous opposition to the measure. Both he and they thought it better to go on as usual: and why?—not because the Church, as a spiritual institution, had more powerful or righteous claims, than any other religious society, to their obedience and attachment; but, simply, "because they all enjoyed such great *liberty*, under the mild and paternal government of his majesty." And what was the definition of *liberty*, propounded by him at this very association?—even "the privilege of ranging up and down, preaching repentance to those multitudes who come neither to church nor meeting; but who are led from curiosity to follow us into the fields." The truth is honestly stated by Mr. Philip: Whitefield had no fixed or definite notions respecting Church government, or Episcopal authority. He was for it, or against it, just as he conceived it to be for, or against, the work of evangelizing the country. He thought *highly* of Episcopal power, when it aided faithful preaching; and *meanly* when it hindered the Gospel. If a bishop did good, or allowed good to be done, Whitefield venerated him and his office too; but he despised both, whenever they were hostile

to truth or zeal. "And, I have no objection to add," says the biographer, "that he despised both, whenever they were hostile to his own sentiments or measures." He was, in fact, his own pope: at once the servant of servants, and the supreme and infallible judge. He very much resembled a political philosopher, who should, by turns, stand forth as the friend, or the enemy, of monarchical or democratic institutions, just as he might happen to contemplate the good or evil workings of either of those respective schemes of government.

The course of thought, by which he fortified himself in his glorious liberty, will be best learned from his own words. "There are"—he said, in one of his sermons—"but two sorts of people. Christ does not say, Are you an Independent, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, or, are you a Church-of-England man? The Lord divides the world into sheep and goats." Well—but, neither does Christ say, are you a Trinitarian, or an Arian, or a Sabellian, or a Nestorian, or a Socinian, or an Humanitarian? And yet, it would hardly have been contended by Whitefield, that it was a matter of profound indifference to which of the above divisions the hearer might belong. But logical discernment, or acute critical faculties, must not, assuredly, be reckoned among the excellences of this zealous and single-hearted man. Had he been so gifted and so accomplished, he could not have failed to discern the extreme danger of pressing too closely the language employed by our Lord, in shadowing forth the general doctrine of final retribution. For, if we are to adhere rigorously to the *letter* of that awful representation, the result must inevitably be, that, in separating the sheep from the goats, no other criterion whatever will be applied, but the performance, or the neglect, of beneficent and charitable offices.

The progress by which Whitefield arrived at the full licence of his *privilege*, as an out-door preacher, seems to have been, like all his other proceedings, extremely artless and simple. He preaches in a church. The place is crammed to suffocation. Hundreds upon hundreds are thronging the church-yard, hungering and thirsting for the bread of life. Why then should the Word be imprisoned within stone walls? Why should it not have free course, and be glorified, beneath the canopy of heaven? This point being settled, it would be no difficult matter to find abundant warrant for this grand and noble scale of operations. The Sermon on the Mount, for example, was a most sublime and glorious instance of field-preaching; for, there, the Preacher had a mountain for his pulpit, and the heavens for his sounding-board; and, when his Gospel was refused by the Jews, he sent his servants into the highways and hedges. "Besides"—said Whitefield—"I always find that I have more power in the open

air; a *proof to me*, that God is pleased with this way of preaching." It is idle to imagine that the "rotten privilege and custom" of ecclesiastical regulation could stand, for an instant, before reasonings and emotions such as these. And hence the astonishing exhibitions of Moorfields, Kennington Common, Blackheath, &c. &c. &c. John Wesley, more orderly and cautious, for a time was repelled and astounded by the somewhat dithyrambic audacity of his fellow-labourer. But he soon caught the infection: and thus, all Methodism was rocked and cradled in the whirlwind of field-preaching. The tempest, however, has now pretty well gone down: and Methodism, adult and mature, pursues a course almost as steady, and as regular, as the national hierarchy itself.

Whitefield was, now, in the condition described by Bishop Gibson, in a letter to Watts,—“From the time that men imagine themselves singled out by God for extraordinary purposes, and, in consequence of that, to be guided by extraordinary impulses and operations, all human *advice*”—he might have added, all human *restraint*—“is lost upon them.” It might have been imagined that all these symptoms of schismatical contumacy, and somewhat fanatical impetuosity, would have strongly recommended Whitefield to the Dissenters, and have brought about something like an offensive and defensive alliance between them. But it happened otherwise. In the first place, it may reasonably be doubted whether Whitefield was, at any time, very solicitous for a coalition with any other sect or party. He was, evidently, better satisfied to move in a path of his own, than to circulate round any common centre, merely as one body in a planetary system. And, secondly, it would appear that the Dissenting communities were, at that time, but ill-disposed for any cordial approximation towards the portentous wanderer. “The fact is,”—says Mr. Philip,—“that the Dissenters, of those times, were, in their own way, almost as great sticklers for *order* as the bishops. Field-preaching was as alarming to the *Board* as to the *Bench*. The Primate would as soon have quitted his throne, as a leading Nonconformist his desk, to preach from a horse-block, or a table, in the open air. Indeed, *aggression* was no part of the character of Dissent, in those days. No wonder! Dissenters had been so long persecuted, even in their secluded and obscure chapels, that they were glad to *sit still* under their vine and their fig-tree; thankful for their own safety, and neither daring, nor dreaming, to go into the high-ways or hedges. It was Methodism that made Dissent aggressive upon the strongholds of Satan. Indeed, until the chief of them were carried by storm by Whitefield and Wesley,

"Dissenters must have dreaded all co-operation with Methodism, "as perilous to their own peace and safety." This is Mr. Philip's version of the matter: and, on the whole, we deem it to be, *substantially*, just. The toleration which the Nonconformists then enjoyed must have left them at leisure for something like temperate reflexion on the history of the preceding century, darkened as it was by the mischiefs, "great and sore," which had been inflicted on society by the spirit which had wrought in the children of disobedience. A hurricane had, then, swept over the land, which had brought desolation in its train: and, surely, it was natural enough that a retrospect of those "heavy times" should produce, in reasonable men, some unwillingness to assist in, once more, untying the winds, which might chance, not only to fight against the churches, but, eventually, to disturb and endanger the conventicles, and to bring back the days of national confusion and strife. But, be this as it may, the biographer positively exults in the shyness of the Dissenters towards the new and dauntless adventurer: he says,—"they "would have spoiled him by their *orderliness*." And, much in the same spirit, Ralph Erskine once declared to Whitefield that there was a manifest "beauty in the providence of his being in "communion with the Church of England; since, otherwise, "such great confluences, from among them, would never have "attended on his ministry." Leaving, however, all these vague speculations, it may be interesting, now that the strong wind and the earthquake have subsided, to consider the result of this great convulsion. And we find that, of all the religious varieties of the present day, Methodism is the least infected with the spirit of anarchy—that its language, for the most part, is conservative and loyal—that it has not wholly lost its reverence and affection for the mother from which it sprung—and that many of its most distinguished worthies have been unable to endure the imputation of a schismatic revolt from her communion. Dissent, on the contrary,—(we grieve to say it, and we speak it with a cordial acknowledgment of many a splendid exception,)—Dissent appears, of late, to have become a sort of "Sanctuary of Romulus;" the refuge of all who are bitter of heart, and unstable in faith; the resort of every passion which can array itself against the religious or civil institutions of the empire. That term of recent mintage, "Political Dissent," is, of itself, a sufficient and most melancholy indication of the present revolutionary temperament of the Dissenting body. And long may the heart of Methodism be sound enough to say to this monstrous confederacy, *My soul, come not thou into their secret; to their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united.*

But to return to Whitefield. We have lately met with a very spirited and ingenious little publication,\* the object of which is to exhibit the contrast between a hearing, and a reading, age. The hearing age is that in which the passions and the imaginations of multitudes are swayed and wielded, with incredible potency, by the recitations of the rhapsodists, or the lengthened exhibitions of the drama, or the overpowering fulminations of the orator. The reading age succeeded, when books began to be multiplied; and it has reached its full ascendancy in the interval which has elapsed since the invention of printing. And marvellous indeed is the revolution which this course of things has brought about. The tumult, and the agitation, and the enchantment, of the hearing age is gone: and it has been followed by a period of calm literary enjoyment, or of sober cautious intellectual exercise, much more refined, it is true, but comparatively tame and spiritless. Books, and pamphlets, and reported speeches, now do the work which formerly was done by the fire of epic or of lyric genius, or by the tempestuous force of impassioned eloquence: and they do it in a manner almost as different, as the slow and artificial process of mere mortal agency is different from the action of that "thought-executing" element which bursts forth from the thunder-cloud. So marked is this difference, as to exhibit human society under aspects essentially distinguished from each other. Now, Whitefield lived in a reading age; but it was the singular triumph of his powers that, in the midst of the serene and almost stagnant tranquillity of the time, he revived, for a space, the stormy wonders of the hearing age. Compare him, in the midst of his thousands, or his myriads, with the occupant of a pulpit surrounded by a few quiet and, alas! perhaps, languid and half-drowsy hundreds,—and the contrast is instantly before us. For, although a modern parochial congregation is, of course, a hearing congregation, it is an assembly well-nigh destitute of the mental habits of a hearing age. They come to listen to a discourse or a lecture; which discourse or lecture, whatever may be its excellence, generally operates more after the manner of a written or printed composition, than of an address directed to the *emotive* faculties of our nature. But Whitefield was, to the crowds that thronged around him, much like what the orator of classic days was to the assembled people. He was a practised and consummate artist; and we say not this to the disparagement of his sincerity or zeal. With him, *delivery* was the first, the second, and the third excellence, in the scale of oratorical perfection. His voice was clear and sonorous. His

\* Mr. Vaughan's Oration in Trinity College Chapel, Dec. 1837.

articulation was faultless. His action was singularly graceful and impressive. His countenance was full of animation and vivacity: and such was the commanding boldness and majesty of his demeanour, that it was somewhat oddly, but yet most strikingly, described, by one of his rustic hearers, who said that "he preached like a lion." His labour was unwearied in the preparation of his sermons, and, more especially, in their subsequent improvement. In short, he was transcendently gifted and accomplished, for the purpose of raising the emotions, and impressing the convictions, which *come by hearing*, and not by the slower progress of studious mental application. And—(independently of his spiritual fervour and devotion)—that individual must have been a marvellous specimen of the human race, who could thus recall, in these prosaic days, an image of the times, when the voice of one man could achieve wonders which, to us, sound all but fabulous!

Of all the testimonies borne to his astonishing powers, none is so unexceptionable and conclusive as that of Franklin; for the soul of Franklin was essentially arithmetical and prosaic. He was a cordial despiser of eloquence and all its works. And yet he himself tells us that, merely as a matter of speculation, he could not but observe the extraordinary influence of Whitefield's oratory on his hearers, and how much they admired and respected him, notwithstanding his common abuse of them, by assuring them that they were, naturally, *half beasts and half devils*. It was wonderful, he adds, to see the change made in the manners of the inhabitants. From being thoughtless or indifferent about religion, it seemed as if all the world was growing religious; so that one could not walk through the town of an evening without hearing psalms sung in different families of every street. In one well-known instance the great philosopher and patriot was, himself, compelled to "own the soft impeachment." The story, we believe, has been doubted. But it is distinctly avouched by Franklin himself; and, therefore, all scepticism about its truth is manifestly unreasonable. We allude to the occasion when Franklin happened to attend one of Whitefield's sermons; in the course of which, perceiving that it was intended to finish with a collection, he armed himself with a dogged resolution to give nothing. The contents of his capacious pouch were a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and five pistoles in gold. The homily proceeded. The philosopher gradually softened; and the *copper* was destined to the collection plate. The next strain of oratory was still higher; and by it the preacher made the *silver* his own. Then came the *finale*, which was absolutely



irresistible ; and the five golden pistoles were added to the spoil.\* It is hardly credible that Franklin would tell this tale if it were false. He would scarcely invent a fiction in honour of Whitefield ; for, though he deemed him a perfectly honest man, yet they had no religious connexion. Whitefield used, indeed, sometimes to pray for the conversion of Franklin, but never had the satisfaction of believing that his prayers were heard. Theirs was a mere civil friendship, which lasted until Whitefield's death. The following instance will show the terms on which they stood. When Franklin, on one occasion, offered Whitefield the accommodation of his house, he replied that if that kind offer was made for Christ's sake, it would not miss of its reward. Upon which Franklin rejoined, " Don't let me be mistaken ; it was not for Christ's sake but your sake : " on which it was jocosely remarked by an acquaintance of both parties, that Franklin had contrived to fix on earth, an obligation, which the saints were sometimes rather too apt to transfer to heaven.†

The testimony of Franklin is valuable on another account ; since it reduces almost to the certainty of calculation what must otherwise have appeared next to incredible,—namely, the immense numbers to whom Whitefield was able to make himself distinctly audible. " He might be heard and understood,"—says Franklin—" at a great distance ; especially as his auditories " observed the most perfect silence. He preached one evening " from the top of the Court House steps (at Philadelphia), which " are in the middle of Market Street, and on the west side of " Second Street, which crosses it at right angles. Both streets " were filled with hearers to a considerable distance. Being " amongst the hindmost in Market Street, I had the curiosity to " learn how far he could be heard, by retiring backwards down " the street towards the river ; and I found his voice distinct till " I came near Front Street, where some noise in that street obscured it. Imagining, then, a semicircle, of which my distance " should be the radius, and that it was filled with auditors, to " each of whom I allowed two square feet, I computed that he might " well be heard by more than thirty thousand. This reconciled " me to the newspaper accounts of his having preached to five " and twenty thousand people in the fields, and to the history of " generals haranguing whole armies ; of which I had sometimes " doubted."‡

We cannot forbear from repeating, here, another very interesting particular in Franklin's notice of this singular man ; because

\* Franklin's Mem. vol. i. p. 161, &c. &c.

† Ibid. p. 163.

‡ Ibid. p. 165, 166.

it shows that he did not disdain to combine with the affectionate fervency of a messenger from God, all the legitimate and most effective artifices of a great master of oratory. "By hearing him often"—Franklin tells us—"I came to distinguish easily between sermons newly composed, and those which had been often preached in the course of his travels. His delivery of the latter was so much improved by frequent repetition, that every accent, every emphasis, every modulation of voice, was so perfectly well turned and well placed that, without being interested in the subject, one could not help being pleased with the discourse; a pleasure much of the same kind with that received from an excellent piece of music." Each of these sermons, therefore, was not *merely* a call to repentance, or an exhortation to holiness of life, or a display of the glory and the blessedness of the new birth: it was, *also*, the rehearsal of a *performance* to be afterwards frequently repeated with a constant accumulation of power. Now, all this is very much in the spirit of the ancient orators—the great masters of a *hearing* age,—and of those who, in the present day, are ambitious of emulating their transcendent excellence. With Demosthenes and Cicero every harangue was a work on which too much elaborate preparation could not possibly be lavished. True to their example, Lord Brougham transcribes, ten times over, the peroration to his celebrated speech on the trial of the Queen. And Whitefield,—though, probably, without wasting a thought upon Demosthenes or Cicero, or any of their followers, and prompted solely by his own consummate genius for public speaking,—converts each successive religious ministration into a profitable exercise of rhetoric and delivery.

With all his genius, however, it is manifest that Whitefield was deficient in those profound and capacious mental faculties which go to the composition of a mighty and immortal instructor of the human race. Of this deficiency the narrative of Mr. Philip has supplied us with one notable instance. At Lewis Town in America, he found, on one occasion, a dull, languid, and, as he calls it, an "un-affected" congregation. Nevertheless, the next day, he made the *politest* of them weep, while he pictured the trials of Abraham's faith; a favourite and efficient sermon with him. But he adds—"Alas! when I came to turn from the creature to the Creator, and to talk of God's love in sacrificing his only begotten Son, their tears, I observed, dried up. I told them of it; and could not but hence infer the dreadful depravity of human nature, that we can weep at the sufferings of a martyr, a mere man like ourselves. But when are we affected at the relation of the sufferings of the Son of God?" Now, any

one who might be conversant with the deeper philosophy of human nature would, undoubtedly, have paused before he ventured to ascribe to its "dreadful depravity" that seeming want of sensibility of which the preacher complains with so much tragic emphasis. The trial of Abraham's faith was a moving subject, precisely *because* the patriarch was "a mere man like ourselves." The scene was one purely of human sorrow. It came home to the heart of every parent in the congregation; and it is by no means wonderful that, in the hands of a painter like Whitefield, it should stir the deepest fountains of human emotion. But there is, in "the sufferings of the Son of God," something too awful, too sacred, too mysterious, for the ordinary sympathies of humanity. Tears are no fit or adequate exponents of that indescribable pathos which rushes upon the soul, when we think of the sacrifice of the only-begotten of the Father. The subject is so solemn, so overpowering, so bewildering—the event is so immeasurably distinct from every other martyrdom—the sorrows of the Son of Man so unlike all other sorrow—that, grief and compassion are almost swallowed up and lost, in wonder, and amazement, and dread. The women, indeed, who personally witnessed the sufferings of our Lord, burst forth into passionate wailing at the spectacle. But, even so, it would almost appear as if,—though kindly and tenderly,—he refused their sympathy. *Weep not for me—he cried—ye daughters of Jerusalem; but weep for yourselves and for your children.*

It was hardly to be expected that a man so constantly engaged as Whitefield in the most awful concerns of futurity, should be very accessible to the passion which, of all others, is supposed to rule most potently the course of this present life. Accordingly, we must not expect to find *Whitefield in love*. But, nevertheless, we actually do find *Whitefield in search of a wife*: and never, surely, did any human being enter upon that search less like a man of this world. The two following letters,—which are inserted as among the most precious curiosities in the whole compass of biography,—will show what pains the great missionary thought it needful to take, in order to guard against the suspicion of being at all liable to the infatuation which exercises so wide and pernicious a predominance over the human race.

"To Mr. and Mrs. D.

On board the Savannah, bound to Philadelphia from Georgia, April 4, 1740.

"My dear Friends,

"I find by experience, that a mistress is absolutely necessary for the due management of my increasing family, and to take off some of that care which at present lies upon me. Besides, I shall in all probability, at my next return from *England*, bring more women with me; and I

find, unless they are all truly gracious, (or indeed if they are,) without a superior, matters cannot be carried on as becometh the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It hath been therefore much impressed upon my heart, that I should marry, in order to have a help meet for me in the work whereunto our dear Lord Jesus hath called me. This comes (like Abraham's servant to Rebekah's relations) to know whether you think your daughter, Miss E——, is a proper person to engage in such an undertaking? If so; whether you will be pleased to give me leave to propose marriage unto her? You need not be afraid of sending me a refusal. For, I bless God, if I know any thing of my own heart, I am free from that foolish passion which the world calls love. I write only because I believe it is the will of God that I should alter my state; but your denial will fully convince me that your daughter is not the person appointed by God for me. He knows my heart; I would not marry but for him, and in him, for ten thousand worlds.—But I have sometimes thought Miss E—— would be my helpmate; for she has often been impressed on my heart. I should think myself safer in your family, because so many of you love the Lord Jesus, and consequently would be more watchful over my precious and immortal soul. After strong crying and tears at the throne of grace for direction, and after unspeakable troubles with my own heart, I write this. Be pleased to spread the letter before the Lord; and if you think this motion to be of him, be pleased to deliver the enclosed to your daughter;—if not, say nothing, only let me know you disapprove of it, and that shall satisfy, dear Sir and Madam,

“Your obliged friend and servant in Christ,

“G. W.”

“To Miss E——.

On board the Savannah, April 4, 1740.

“Be not surprised at the contents of this:—the letter sent to your honoured father and mother will acquaint you with the reasons. Do you think you could undergo the fatigues that must necessarily attend being joined to one, who is every day liable to be called out to suffer for the sake of Jesus Christ? Can you bear to leave your father and kindred's house, and to trust on him (who feedeth the young ravens that call upon him) for your own and children's support, supposing it should please him to bless you with any? Can you bear the inclemencies of the air, both as to cold and heat, in a foreign climate? Can you, when you have a husband, be as though you had none, and willingly part with him, even for a long season, when his Lord and Master shall call him forth to preach the Gospel, and command him to leave you behind? If after seeking to God for direction, and searching your heart, you can say, ‘I can do all those things through Christ strengthening me,’ what if you and I were joined together in the Lord, and you came with me at my return from England, to be a helpmeet for me in the management of the orphan-house? I have great reason to believe it is the divine will that I should alter my condition, and have often thought you were the person appointed for me. I shall still wait on God for direction, and heartily intreat him, that if this motion be not of him, it may come to nought.—I write thus plainly, because I trust I write not from any other principles but the love of God.—I shall make it my business to call on the Lord

Jesus, and would advise you to consult both him and your friends—for in order to attain a blessing, we should call both the Lord Jesus and his disciples to the marriage.—I much like the manner of Isaac's marrying with Rebekah; and think no marriage can succeed well, unless both parties concerned are like-minded with Tobias and his wife.—I think I can call the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to witness, that I desire 'to take you my sister to wife, not for lust, but uprightly;' and therefore I hope he will mercifully ordain, if it be his blessed will we should be joined together, that we may walk as Zachary and Elisabeth did, in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless. I make no great profession to you, because I believe you think me sincere. The passionate expressions which carnal courtiers use, I think ought to be avoided by those who marry in the Lord. I can only promise by the help of God, 'to keep my matrimonial vow, and to do what I can towards helping you forward in the great work of your salvation.' If you think marriage will be any way prejudicial to your better part, be so kind as to send me a denial. I would not be a snare to you for the world. You need not be afraid of speaking your mind,—I trust I love you only for God, and desire to be joined to you only by his command and for his sake. With fear and much trembling I write, and shall patiently tarry the Lord's leisure, till he is pleased to incline you, dear Miss E——, to send an answer to,

"Your affectionate brother, friend,

"and servant in Christ,

"G. W."

"It will not be wondered at, now,"—says Mr. Philip—"that these epistles defeated their own wise purpose, by their unwise form." It seems, however, that Whitefield, though utterly estranged from amatory weakness, was still bent upon matrimony; and that, eventually, he succeeded. The fact of his marriage is abruptly brought to our notice, not in the form of historical statement, but in the way of indirect allusion, at the opening of the XIth chapter; which begins with the remark, that "it is a misnomer to call Whitefield's conjugal life, domestic: his engagements, like Wesley's, being incompatible with domestic happiness—as that is understood by domestic men." From the sequel, however, we are enabled to learn that his elect lady was a widow, of the name of James, who, although once gay, was then a despised follower of the cross. There next ensues some doubtful disputation as to the fitness of the person in question to assist him in sustaining the burden of his mighty and manifold undertakings. Mr. Philip laments that he should have sought for a companion in the ranks of widowhood; and Cornelius Winter affirmed that he was not happy in his wife, and that her death set his mind much at rest. It is evident, however, that his matrimonial adventure, if not eminently felicitous, was much

more prosperous than that of Wesley; for, otherwise, he would never have spoken of his wife,—as he has done throughout a long series of letters,—in the language of kindness and esteem. They were married on the 11th of November, 1741; but, before the honeymoon was over, the bridegroom was electrifying Bristol, as in the days of old. In August, 1768, Mrs. Whitefield died; and Whitefield himself preached her funeral sermon, from the following text, which, as Mr. Philip observes, does not appear as if it had been studiously selected for the purpose of complimenting her memory;—*for, the creature was made subject to vanity; not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same, in hope.* The issue of this marriage was one son, which was taken from them at the age of four months. There is something most deeply affecting in Whitefield's own narrative of this melancholy and trying event.

“ ‘Who knows what a day may bring forth? Last night I was called to sacrifice my Isaac; I mean, to bury my only child and son, about four months old. Many things occurred to make me believe he was not only to be continued to me, but to be a preacher of the everlasting Gospel. Pleased with the thought, and ambitious of having a son of my own so divinely employed, Satan was permitted to give me some wrong impressions, whereby, as I now find, I misapplied several texts of Scripture. Upon these grounds I made no scruple of declaring ‘that I should have a son, and that his name was to be John.’ I mentioned the very time of his birth, and fondly hoped that he was to be great in the sight of the Lord. Every thing happened according to the predictions; and my wife having had several narrow escapes while pregnant, especially by her falling from a high horse, and my driving her into a deep ditch in a one-horse chaise a little before the time of her confinement, and from which we received little or no hurt, confirmed me in my expectation, that God would grant me my heart's desire. I would observe to you, that the child was even born in a room which the master of the house had prepared as a prison for his wife for coming to hear me. With joy would she often look upon the bars, and staples, and chains which were fixed in order to keep her in. About a week after his birth I publicly baptized him in the Tabernacle, and in the company of thousands solemnly gave him up to that God who gave him to me. A hymn, too, fondly composed by an aged widow, as suitable to the occasion, was sung, and all went away big with hopes of the child's being hereafter to be employed in the work of God; but how soon are all their fond, and, as the event hath proved, their ill-grounded expectations blasted as well as mine! Housekeeping being expensive in London, I thought it best to send both parent and child to Abergavenny, where my wife had a little house of my own, the furniture of which, as I thought of soon embarking for Georgia, I had partly sold, and partly given away. In their journey thither, they stopped at Gloucester, at the Bell Inn, which my brother now keeps, and in which I was born. There

my beloved was cut off with a stroke. Upon my coming here, without knowing what had happened, I inquired concerning the welfare of parent and child; and by the answer found that the flower was cut down. I immediately called all to join in prayer, in which I blessed the Father of mercies for giving me a son, continuing it to me so long, and taking it from me so soon. All joined in desiring that I would decline preaching till the child was buried; but I remember a saying of good Mr. Henry, 'that weeping must not hinder sowing,' and therefore preached twice the next day, and also the day following; on the evening of which, just as I was closing my sermon the bell struck out for the funeral. At first, I must acknowledge, it gave nature a little shake, but looking up I recovered strength, and then concluded with saying, that this text on which I had been preaching, namely, 'All things worked together for good to them that love God,' made me as willing to go out to my son's funeral, as to hear of his birth. Our parting from him was solemn. We kneeled down, prayed, and shed many tears, but I hope tears of resignation; and then, as he died in the house wherein I was born, he was taken and laid in the church where I was baptized, first communicated, and first preached. All this you may easily guess threw me into very solemn and deep reflection, and I hope deep humiliation; but I was comforted from that passage in the book of Kings, where is recorded the death of the Shunammite's child, which the prophet said, 'the Lord had hid from him;' and the woman's answer likewise to the prophet when he asked, 'Is it well with thee? Is it well with thy husband? Is it well with thy child?' And she answered, '*It is well.*' This gave me no small satisfaction. I immediately preached upon the text the day following at Gloucester, and then hastened up to London, preached upon the same there; and though disappointed of a *living* preacher by the death of my son, yet I hope what happened before his birth, and since at his death, hath taught me such lessons, as, if duly improved, may render his mistaken parent more cautious, more sober-minded, more experienced in Satan's devices, and consequently more useful in his future labours to the church of God. Thus, 'out of the eater comes forth sweetness.' Not doubting but our future life will be one continued explanation of this *blessed riddle*, I commend myself and you to the unerring guidance of God's word and Spirit.'—p. 275—277.

Perhaps, of all the particulars in the history of Whitefield, there is none which will appear so utterly astounding, at the present day, as his total insensibility to that foul blot in Christian society, the institution of slavery. On his arrival in Georgia, in 1738, he found the colony in a very languishing condition; and the most desperate feature in the case was, that "the people were denied the use of *rum* and *slaves*! To place a people there, "on such a footing,"—he said,—"was little better than to tie their legs, and bid them walk. The scheme was well-meant at home. But, as too many years' experience evidently proved, it "was absolutely impracticable in so hot a country abroad." But

this is not all. When once the Orphan House was founded, Whitefield became, himself, a proprietor of slaves. Mr. Philip declares that he has seen the inventory, in Whitefield's own handwriting, of the dead and live stock belonging to that establishment : in which document, carts, cattle, and slaves, are described and valued with equal formality and *nonchalance*. In his memorial to the governor of Georgia, for a grant of lands to found a college, he urges his request by stating, that " a considerable sum of money " is intended speedily to be laid out in the purchase of a large " number of negroes." And, in his memorial to the king, praying for a charter to the intended college, he pledges himself to give up his trust, and to make a free gift of all lands, *negroes*, goods, and chattels, for the present founding, and towards the future support, of a college to be called *Bethesda*, (*the House of Mercy*!) He makes a similar appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury; and labours to satisfy his Grace that, by laying out only a thousand pounds in the purchase of an additional number of negroes, the income of the college would be easily and speedily augmented. Well may his biographer exclaim, *Lord, what is man*! But the instance of this prodigious inconsistency, is by no means a solitary one. It is well known that John Newton, for some considerable time after he became an awakened man, continued to sail as a mariner on board a slave-ship; and this, too, without much molestation from the upbraidings of his conscience : a fact still more amazing than even the apathy of Whitefield; since the occupation of Newton must have brought him perpetually into close contact with the unutterable horrors of the traffic, and of the middle passage across the sea. But, long familiarity with these legalized abominations, had blunted his perception of their infernal atrocity and cruelty. He may, perhaps, have found the employment disagreeable enough. But, it was his vocation! It was the course of life to which Providence had called him. And, if it were wicked, it still never seems to have once occurred to him that he, a mere *operative*, could be at all responsible for its wickedness. Now, happily, all this must appear quite incomprehensible to most people, at this present time. A pious and Christian sailor serving on board a slave-ship, seems scarcely more conceivable to us, than a *serious* and *evangelical* waiter, at a gambling-house or a brothel. With regard to Whitefield, it does not appear that, to the end of his life, he was ever awakened to the infamy and horror of degrading his fellow-creatures to the level of brutes. In this respect, the preacher of glory to God and good will towards man, was scarcely a whit wiser or better than the age in which he lived. If he had lived at a later period, doubtless his heart and voice would have been



with them, who laboured, through good report and evil report, to lift off from this nation the load of that stupendous sin.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter of the present work, is the 32nd, which treats of "Whitefield's Characteristics." The biographer has here brought together, from various quarters, a multitude of particulars, most vividly illustrative of the man. In the course of this chapter, the question is started, whether Whitefield would be popular now, were he alive. And the opinion of Mr. Philip is, that his sermons would not, at this day, bring together their thousands and their tens of thousands; because the doctrine of the New Birth is, now, no longer a *novelty*, as it was then. The *novelty* of the doctrine will scarcely be denied; and this may, doubtless, have been one most powerful source of fascination and attraction. Whether it was a legitimate source, is another question. Novelty, it must surely be allowed, is, at the best, but a very questionable recommendation to any scheme of Christian doctrine. There have been times, and those among the brightest in the history of the Church, when theological *innovation* would have been called by a much more unceremonious name. But, be this as it may,—we are entirely like-minded with the author, when he affirms, that holy *energy* can never be unpopular; that holy *daring* will always wield the multitude; that natural eloquence will, for ever, find an echo in the human heart; and, consequently, that, if another Whitefield were to arise, he could scarcely fail to realize some portion of the wonders which are here recorded of his prototype. We cordially wish that we could, further, sympathise with the writer in his bright anticipation of the wonders which, as he seems to imagine, might likewise be accomplished by other preachers, if they would but keep this marvellous *exemplar* constantly before their eyes. His familiarity with such full-orbed excellence, has absolutely betrayed him into a strange extremity of intolerance. He has no patience with human mediocrity. The natural and constitutional deficiencies of them that wait upon the altar, he scruples not to stigmatize as so many moral blemishes and failures. "Let the rising "ministry"—he exclaims—"take warning. Awkwardness in the "pulpit is a sin—monotony a sin—dulness a sin—and, all of "them, sins against the welfare of immortal souls. It is as easy "to be graceful in gesture, and natural in tone, as it is to be "grammatical. You would not dare to violate grammar. Dare "not to be vulgar and vapid in manner." Alas! we greatly fear, that these solemn and sonorous denunciations will be received by many with an incredulous smile; and by others with feelings of despondency, rather than of emulation. Most deeply gratified, indeed, shall we be, if appeals like this, let them come from what

quarter they may, shall be found to stimulate any portion of *our* "rising ministry" to the cultivation of an eloquence worthy of the pulpit. But still, we utterly "despair the charm," as a thing of sufficient potency to banish all monotony, and dulness, and want of ease and grace from our churches. It really does appear to us, that, to achieve this consummation, would require a *regenerating* influence, almost as wonderful as that which was the perpetual theme of the mighty orator himself. Besides, we listen rather unwillingly and distrustfully to these high-wrought speculations, on another account. Their tendency is, to exalt the Pulpit too far above the Desk; to make the performance of man the very life and soul of all public worship; and thus to "turn awry the current" of our thoughts from the much more profitable exercise of still and quiet communion with God, in prayer. This, indeed, is the danger to be mainly apprehended from the contemplation of characters like Whitefield and the Wesleys. It is too apt to habituate the mind to the belief that God is chiefly, if not exclusively, to be sought in the fire, and the earthquake, and the rushing wind. It leads to the suspicion that, where there is no violent excitement—no high-toned vehemence—no mastery exerted over the passions or the fancy—there can be no devotion, no zeal, no advancement in godliness, no effective working of the spirit of holiness and consolation. And, if this persuasion should become predominant and overpowering, it needs must vitiate the whole spiritual temperament, and bring on, at last, an incurable distaste for all the sedate and tranquil offices of religion. In saying this, however, we desire not to be misunderstood. Nothing can be further from our thoughts than to speak, in terms of ungracious disparagement, of the mighty labours of these wonderful men. It is true, that, rightly to estimate, or to compare, the good, or the evil, that may have resulted from their goings forth, is a task which greatly surpasses all human sagacity and wisdom. But, even if it be granted that the preponderance of good has been unquestionably vast, it still must be remembered that phenomena, like these, are but of rare occurrence. They must be numbered among the deviations from the ordinary course of Providence. And, when they are gone by, the moral and spiritual destinies of man are left to the operation of a more uniform and peaceful agency. The revival—or the spiritual crisis—or the sudden shaking of the people—may do something towards stirring and freshening, from time to time, the stagnant atmosphere of religion. But yet, after all, it is not to these that we principally trust for the moral sanity of the world. The virtue and influence of the *still small voice* succeeds, at length, to these com-

motions. And, so long as men have an ear to hear it, we do not well to be impatient for the return of a more tumultuous season.

It has been said by some, that Whitefield's published sermons are *worthless*. *Worthless*, in one sense, they may be. We should never think of putting them into the hands of a student of theology, as a work of high authority or value. Neither should we venture to hold them up, indiscriminately, as safe models of composition, to a candidate for the Christian ministry. It is, indeed, acknowledged by one of his great admirers, Cornelius Winter, that his peculiar talents can be but faintly guessed from his printed works. *Worthless*, however, his writings are not, as specimens of that strain of preaching which, when combined with eminent powers of delivery, is fitted to arrest the attention of all classes of men—from Hume, and Bolingbroke, and Lord Chesterfield, down to the lowest ruffian of Kingswood or Moorfields. It cannot but be most instructive to examine the sort of material which was capable of being wrought up into an instrument of such surprising and almost universal power. And we doubt not that men of sound judgments and benevolent hearts, might easily derive from Whitefield's extant "Remains," many an useful suggestion, for the improvement of their own ministrations. For instance, what is there in the following appeal, which might not be most profitably heard from any pulpit in the Establishment:—

"Did Moses and Elias appear in glory? Are there any old saints here? I doubt not but there are a considerable number. And are any of you afraid of death? Do any of you carry about with you a body that weighs down your immortal soul? I am sure a poor creature is preaching to you, that every day drags a crazy load along. But come, believers, come, ye children of God, come, ye aged, decrepit saints, come and trample upon that monster death. As thou goest over yonder church-yard, do as I know an old excellent Christian in Maryland did; go, sit upon the grave, and meditate upon thine own dissolution. Thou mayst, perhaps, have a natural fear of dying; the body and the soul do not care to part without a little sympathy and a groan; but O, look yonder, look up to heaven, see there thy Jesus, thy Redeemer, and learn that thy body is to be fashioned hereafter like unto Christ's most glorious body. That poor body which is now subject to gout and gravel, and that thou canst scarce drag along; that poor body, which hinders thee so much in the spiritual life, will ere long hinder thee no more: it shall be put into the grave; but though it be sown in corruption, it shall be raised in incorruption; though it be sown in dishonour, it shall be raised again in glory. This consideration made blessed Paul to cry out, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?' Thy soul and body shall be united together again, and thou shalt be 'for ever with the Lord.' Those knees of thine, which perhaps are

hard by kneeling in prayer ; that tongue of thine, which hath sung hymns to Christ ; those hands of thine, which have wrought for God ; those feet, which have ran to Christ's ordinances ; shall all, in the twinkling of an eye, be changed ; and thou shalt be able to stand under an exceeding and an eternal weight of glory. Come then, ye believers in Christ, look beyond the grave ; come, ye dear children of God, and however weak and sickly ye are now, say, Blessed be God, I shall soon have a body strong, full of vigour and of glory."—pp. 576, 577.

Again—which of our *masters of assemblies* might not be glad to ply the consciences and the affections of his hearers, on this wise :—

" Did the Father say, ' This is my beloved Son, hear him ? ' Then let every one of our hearts echo to this testimony given of Christ, ' This is my beloved Saviour.' Did God so love the world, as to send his only begotten Son, his well-beloved Son to preach to us ? Then, my dear friends, *hear Him*. What God said seventeen hundred years ago, immediately by a voice from heaven, concerning his Son upon the Mount, that same thing God says to you immediately by his word, ' Hear Him.' If ye never heard him before, hear him now. Hear him so as to take him to be your Prophet, Priest, and your King ; hear him, so as to take him to be your God and your all. Hear him to-day, ye youth, while it is called to-day ; hear him now, lest God should cut you off before you have another invitation to hear him ; hear him while he cries, ' Come unto me ; ' hear him while he opens his hand and his heart ; hear him while he knocks at the door of your souls, lest you should hear him saying, ' Depart, depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' Hear him, ye old and grey-headed ; hear him, ye that have one foot in the grave ; hear him, I say ; and if ye are dull of hearing, beg of God to open the ears of your hearts, and your blind eyes ; beg of God that you may have an enlarged and a believing heart, and that ye may know what the Lord God saith concerning you. God will resent it, he will avenge himself on his adversaries, if you do not hear a blessed Saviour. He is God's Son, he is God's beloved Son ; he came upon a great errand, even to shed his precious blood for sinners ; he came to cleanse you from all sin, and to save you with an everlasting salvation. Ye who have heard him, *hear him again* ; still go on, believe in and obey him, and by and by you shall hear him saying, ' Come, ye blessed of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' "—pp. 578, 579.

But here, albeit reluctantly, we must break off, and conclude our somewhat miscellaneous and desultory notice with two incidents of Whitefield's life ; the first of which shows the astonishing predominance of the spirit over the flesh, when the mind is wound up to a high intensity of action ; the other is singularly illustrative of Whitefield's perfect self-possession and presence of mind, in the midst of stately and high-born dames. In the year 1744, while itinerating in America, he caught a severe cold, and

was brought to the gates of death. Three physicians attended him during the night. Nevertheless, in the midst of his sufferings, his chief anxiety was, to avoid disappointing the people to whom it had been announced that he was to preach the next evening:—

“ I felt a divine life *distinct* from my animal life, which made me, as it were, laugh at my pains, though every one thought I was ‘ taken with death.’ My dear York physician was then about to administer a medicine. I on a sudden cried out, Doctor, my pains are suspended : by the help of God, I’ll go and preach, and then come home and die ! With some difficulty I reached the pulpit. All looked quite surprised, as though they saw one risen from the dead. Indeed, I was as pale as death, and told them they must look upon me as a dying man, come to bear my dying testimony to the truths I had formerly preached to them. All seemed melted, and were drowned in tears. The cry after me, when I left the pulpit, was like the cry of sincere mourners when attending the funeral of a dear departed friend. Upon my coming home, I was laid on a bed upon the ground, near the fire, and I heard them say, ‘ *He is gone !*’ But God was pleased to order it otherwise. I gradually recovered.

“ Gillies has added to this account an interesting anecdote, from some of Whitefield’s papers. A poor negro woman insisted upon seeing the invalid, when he began to recover. She came in, and sat down on the ground, and looked earnestly in his face. She then said, in broken accents, ‘ Massa, you just go to heaven’s gate. But Jesus Christ said, Get you down, get you down, you must not come here yet : go first, and call some more poor negroes.’ I prayed to the Lord that, if I was to live, this might be the event.”—pp. 321, 322.

The other anecdote in question, Mr. Philip tells us,

“ Was communicated by the Countess of Huntingdon to the late Barry, R. A. ; and sent by him to me. I give it in his own words:— Some ladies called one Saturday morning, to pay a visit to Lady Huntingdon, and, during the visit, her Ladyship inquired of them if they had ever heard Mr. Whitefield preach ? Upon being answered in the negative, she said, ‘ I wish you would hear him, he is to preach to-morrow evening at such a church or chapel,’ the name of which the writer forgets (nor is it material) : they promised her Ladyship they would certainly attend. They were as good as their word ; and upon calling on the Monday morning on her Ladyship, she anxiously inquired if they had heard Mr. Whitefield on the previous evening, and how they liked him ? The reply was, ‘ O my Lady, of all the preachers we ever heard, he is the most strange and unaccountable. Among other preposterous things, (would your Ladyship believe it ?) he declared that Jesus Christ was so willing to receive sinners, that he did not object to receive even the devil’s *castaways*. Now, my Lady, did you ever hear of such a thing since you was born.’ To which her Ladyship made the following reply : ‘ There is something, I acknowledge, a little singular in the invitation, and I do not recollect to have ever met with it

before ; but as Mr. Whitefield is below in the parlour, we'll have him up, and let him answer for himself.' Upon his coming up into the drawing-room, Lady Huntingdon said, ' Mr. Whitefield, these ladies have been preferring a very heavy charge against you, and I thought it best that you should come up and defend yourself : they say, that in your sermon last evening, in speaking of the willingness of Jesus Christ to receive sinners, you expressed yourself in the following terms,—' that so ready was Christ to receive sinners who came to him, that he was willing to receive even the devil's castaways.' Mr. Whitefield immediately replied, ' I certainly, my Lady, must plead guilty to the charge ; whether I did what was right or otherwise, your Ladyship shall judge from the following circumstance. Did your Ladyship notice, about half an hour ago, a very modest single rap at the door ? It was given by a poor, miserable-looking, aged female, who requested to speak with me. I desired her to be shown into the parlour, when she accosted me in the following manner :—' I believe, Sir, you preached last evening at such a chapel.' ' Yes, I did.' ' Ah, Sir ; I was accidentally passing the door of that chapel, and hearing the voice of some one preaching, I did what I have never been in the habit of doing, I went in ; and one of the first things I heard you say, was, that Jesus Christ was so willing to receive sinners, that he did not object to receiving the devil's castaways. Now, Sir, I have been on the town for many years, and am so worn out in his service, that I think I may with truth be called one of the devil's castaways : do you think, Sir, that Jesus Christ would receive me ?' Mr. Whitefield assured her there was not a doubt of it, if she was but willing to go to him. From the sequel it appeared that it was the case, and that it ended in the sound conversion of this poor creature ; and Lady Huntingdon was assured, from most respectable authority, that the woman left a very charming testimony behind her that, though her sins had been of a crimson hue, the atoning blood of Christ had washed them white as snow."—p. 509—511.

One parting word to Mr. Philip. Although he belongs to a school widely different from our own, we are profoundly convinced that the cause of religion, *pure and undefiled*, is close to his very heart. We would, therefore, respectfully request of him to consider whether, on one or two occasions, he has not, for a moment, lost sight of the seriousness and the sobriety demanded by the sacred realities which his theme involves. For instance—we hope not to be condemned for morbid or fastidious sensibility, touching such matters, if we express a grave doubt whether one of the most awfully impressive representations in Scripture ought to have been exhibited in combination with an image approaching to the ludicrous, as in the following passage. Speaking of the Orphan-House in Georgia, he says, " It compelled him (Whitefield) to travel, and it inspired him to preach. It was his *hobby*, certainly. But, by riding it well, he made it, like the *White Horse* of the Apocalypse, the means of going forth

"conquering, and to conquer." If Mr. Philip will only turn, once more, to the 19th chapter of Revelations, and read from verse 11th to verse 16th, inclusive, he will instantly perceive how much that tremendous description is degraded by the above association. Again, we suspect that Whitefield himself, if he were now living, would remonstrate with his encomiast for speaking of him as "the *Peter* of England's Pentecost." He may, like other mortals, have had his weaknesses. He may have had his occasional fits of rather proud humility; as when he exclaimed, "Why me, Lord, why me?" He may, at times, have been impatient for the honours of such persecution and martyrdom as were to be had in an age of freedom and toleration. But, unless he was much more inflated with spiritual arrogance than we ever supposed him to be, he would, we should imagine, have been ready almost to rend his garments, on beholding himself thus elevated to a level with the Apostles! We feel, however, no satisfaction in dwelling on inadvertencies like these. We shall accordingly finish, by declaring that, whatever may be Mr. Philip's qualifications for the task of a philosophical historian, he has, at all events, in our humble judgment, done the office of a faithful and interesting biographer.

---

ART. II.—1. *The Primitive Doctrine of Election; or an Historical Inquiry into the Ideality and Causation of Scriptural Election, as received and maintained in the Primitive Church of Christ.* By George Stanley Faber, B.D. &c. Crofts: London, 1836.

2. *The Doctrine of Election, and its Connection with the general Tenor of Christianity, illustrated from many parts of Scripture, and especially from the Epistle to the Romans.* By Thomas Erskine, Esq., Advocate. Duncan: London, 1837.

THERE is no surer guide to the discovery of the true doctrine of Scripture, so far at least as that doctrine depends upon the proper meaning of words, than an intimate acquaintance with the opinions of the Primitive Church. As the language of the New Testament bears a reference, more or less direct, to the institutions of the older economy, as held by the patriarchs and expounded by the prophets, it might be presumed, on that ground alone, that the terms employed by Jewish converts, such as constituted the first flock of Christ, would be best understood by those to whom the doctrines of the Rabbis, at the era of the

Advent, were most familiar. It is a remark of the learned Dodwell, that the writings of St. Paul cannot be fully explained, except by assuming the principle that he often expressed himself *ex mente Pharisæorum*; and that his views concerning predestination, foreknowledge, election, and the Divine decrees, in general, must be considered through the medium of the school in which he received his education. But without laying too much stress on this observation, it will be readily admitted by every competent judge, that the Primitive Church is its own best interpreter; that the proximity of the first believers to the times of the Apostles, gave them great advantages for becoming acquainted with the import of words, as used by those inspired servants of the Redeemer; and hence, if a doctrine was unknown to the faithful, in the beginning of the second century, we may conclude that it was not taught either as an article of belief or as a motive to good living.

The Calvinistic notion of election has often been most triumphantly refuted on the ground of scriptural interpretation, and even by an appeal to those feelings of truth, justice, and mercy implanted in the human breast, which, in their unsophisticated state, constitute at once a revelation of the Divine will, and a law whereby are sanctioned the original determinations of the intellect as to moral good and evil. But there was still wanting the historical proof that the tenet in question made no part of the evangelical system once delivered to the saints, and that it cannot be traced beyond a certain period to which the authority of apostolical teaching did not come down, and where of course it must rest exclusively upon the professional knowledge or ingenuity of an individual author. This desideratum is supplied by Mr. Faber, who, after minutely examining the works of all the Fathers prior to Augustine, affords to his readers the most perfect assurance that, down to the fifth century, the Church of Christ never gave any countenance to the strange system of opinions advanced by the Bishop of Hippo. The primitive Christians, he reminds us, *must* have annexed *some* ideas to the scriptural terms Election and Predestination; and when we recollect that they must have received their doctrinal instruction either from the Apostles themselves, or from those who were taught by the Apostles, "it is difficult to believe, that they could have annexed to them any other ideas than those which were annexed to them by their inspired, and therefore infallible teachers." What these primitive notions really were he sets forth at great length, and with much strength of argument; but before we can undertake to make our readers acquainted with the train of thought along which they are conducted to the important con-



clusions wherein the reasoning terminates, it will be necessary to explain two or three of his phrases.

This laborious and learned work professes to be an "Historical Inquiry into the *Ideality* and *Causation* of Scriptural Election." Suffice it, then, to say that Ideality expresses the import of the privileges, benefits, or blessings which are comprehended in election; and that Causation refers to the motive or object in the Divine Mind whence the act of election proceeds. The one, in short, denotes the thing, and the other the moving cause which led to it. Again, the author divides the hypotheses which have been entertained on the subject of Election into three classes—Calvinism, Arminianism, and Nationalism. The two former require no explanation; and, as to the last, it may be enough to say, that it designates the theory of Locke, Whitby, and Taylor, who assert that the term election, in the Old Testament as well as in the New, applies only to the choice or separation of a whole people or large bodies of men, to constitute a visible Church, and to enjoy the privileges attached to it. Mr. Faber declares that, in the early ecclesiastical writings, "neither Calvinism, nor Arminianism, nor Nationalism could, as systems combining severally a well-defined scheme of *Causation* with a well-defined scheme of *Ideality*, be anywhere discovered."

"While in the course of my researches I was struck with perceiving *negatively* that, in the early writings of the Church, not a vestige of those systems, *as* systems, could be discovered; I was also struck with perceiving *positively* that yet a fourth system, essentially different from all the three, in point either of Ideality or of Causation, or of both Ideality and Causation, was, by the earliest Church Catholic, received and delivered, as exhibiting the true sense and manner in which the scriptural terms *Elect* and *Predestinate*, or *Election* and *Predestination*, ought to be explained and understood. At what precise time the system now denominated Arminianism arose, I am unable to say. It was received among the schoolmen anterior to the Reformation; but in point both of Ideality and Causation, it was utterly unknown to the strictly earliest Church, or the Church down to about the end of the second century. As little am I able to specify the commencement of the system which I have distinguished by the appellation of Nationalism, if Locke were not its original author. Some specious passages in its favour, by which I mean *in favour of its ideality*, may doubtless be produced from the writings of the ancient Fathers, though Locke does not profess to avail himself of their evidence; but when these passages are carefully examined, they will prove to give no support to the system in question. Calvinism, on the contrary, has its commencement marked with an uncommon degree of precision. Wishing fairly to come to the bottom of the matter, and well aware that Augustine had taught the system long before the days of the celebrated Calvin, I employed my first season of leisure in carefully perusing the whole Pelagian contro-

versy of that eminent Father ; during the course of which, and specially toward the conclusion of it, he is known to have copiously stated, and to have vigorously maintained, the system now under consideration. The result was precisely what I had anticipated from my previous reading of the *earlier* Fathers. When Augustine fully propounded his own views of *Election* and *Predestination*, he was immediately charged with innovating upon the ancient doctrine of the Church ; he was assured by the complainants that they had never before heard of such speculations ; he was referred to the current system of the existing Catholic Church ; and he was challenged to produce evidence that his new opinions had ever been advanced as the mind of Scripture by any of his ecclesiastical predecessors."

The method adopted by Mr. Faber in the prosecution of his argument, resembles that of which Bilson set the example when reasoning with the Puritans on Church government. Cartwright, following in the steps of his master Calvin, thought proper to maintain the Divine institution of a lay eldership, relying on the accuracy of the exposition hazarded by the school of Geneva, as applied to the often-quoted passage in the first epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, " Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine." From these words it was inferred, that the Apostles had authorized an order of men to govern the Church who had no commission to administer the word and sacraments. Their function was supposed to be confined to ecclesiastical discipline. Archbishop Whitgift, who wrote an answer to Cartwright's " Admonition," knew not how to get over this apparent authority drawn from the Scriptures, and therefore frankly acknowledged that, in the days of the Apostles and for some time after, the Church was under the government of these lay elders. Dr. Bilson, regretting this concession on the part of a prelate who held so distinguished an office in the Anglican Establishment, resolved to reconsider the grounds on which the conclusion was made to rest. Upon recurring to the first ages of Christianity, he found that, in no time or place mentioned by any class of writers, was there any evidence that there ever had been an order of lay-presbyters. It seemed strange that, if such a class of men everywhere governed the Church under the Apostles, no council, history, or father, should ever so much as name them, or allude to them, or even give to the words of St. Paul the meaning which Calvin claimed for them. He found that many learned and ancient Fathers had examined and sifted the import of the words, 1 Timothy, v. 17, and not one of them ever so much as surmised that any such thing was in the mind of the inspired author. Chrysostom, Jerome, Ambrose, Theodoret, Primasius,

Œcumenius, Theophylact, and divers others, had studied and expounded this text, and never dreamed of any lay-presbytery to be mentioned in them. "If then," says Bilson, "the words of St. Paul stand fair and clear, without this late device, as in the judgment of these ancient and learned writers they do, what reason, after fifteen hundred years, to entertain a new platform of governing the Church by laymen, upon a bare conceit that the words of St. Paul may sound to that effect." He then shows in what sense St. Chrysostom and other Greek writers understood them; namely, "that as, in a minister of the Word, good life, good government, and good doctrine are required; the two first are commended, but painfulness in the word is chiefly to be preferred in men of their calling: and so it was not two sorts of elders, but two parts of the pastoral charge that were implied in the apostolical advice."

On a similar principle the author of *The Primitive Doctrine of Election* refutes the notions of the Calvinist relative to this important tenet; showing that the Fathers of the primitive Church were not acquainted with any such article of belief; that it was not taught as an institute of the Gospel; that the disciples of the Apostles were entirely ignorant of it; and that for three centuries after the death of St. John it was not communicated to the faithful as a part of the truth that is in Jesus. But Augustine, in his own defence (for, as we have seen, he was charged with innovation), maintained that he set forth no new scheme of doctrine; on the contrary, that he faithfully delivered to posterity that which he had received from those who lived before him. This declaration, however, was not deemed satisfactory, nor was it received with the submission to which his rising fame might have seemed to entitle him. The Christians resident in the southern parts of Gaul, communicating with him through Prosper and Hilary, did not conceal their surprise and disappointment that he should have published opinions at once so new and so startling on one of the most interesting subjects connected with their faith as servants of the Redeemer:—"We heartily approve of your general confutation of Pelagius and his followers: but why do you superfluously mingle with it a system of novel peculiarities, which we cannot receive? To say nothing of what we at least deem the utter inconsistency of that system with Scripture, it is in truth quite new to us. We never even so much as heard of it before; we find it unsanctioned by any one of the preceding Fathers; and we perceive it to be contrary to the sense of the whole Catholic Church. Be assured, however, that, *this one matter excepted*, we cordially admire your holiness, both in all your doings and in all your sayings."

Here was a plain and distinct challenge on a specific point—the *novelty* of his doctrine as to Predestination and the Final Perseverance of the Saints. He denied that the doctrine was new; and how did he prove his negation? He admits that the Church was not wont to bring forward, in her public ministrations, the article of Predestination; because, in former times, she had no enemy to encounter, no gainsayer to convince; but he adds that, notwithstanding this habitual silence on the topic in question, she *must* always have held the doctrine, because she has always prayed that unbelievers may be converted to the faith, and that believers may “persevere to the end.” With respect, again, to the more ancient Fathers, he adduces out of their whole number only three,—Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose; and, on the warrant of a few expressions selected from their works, he pronounces that they all teach his system of Predestination with the utmost harmony. Let us weigh their evidence, as prepared for this test, by the diligence of our author.

Of the three divines on whom Augustine relies, Cyprian, the earliest of them, did not flourish till about the middle of the third century. The two others lived during the latter part of the fourth century; and hence, had this testimony been altogether satisfactory, we should still have had only a meagre list of three witnesses, the first of whom did not exist till more than a century and a half after the Apostolic age. But, in truth, the witness of Cyprian and Gregory is so utterly irrelevant, that it is surprising it should ever have been brought forward; while the citations from Ambrose, when properly considered, will be found little more to the purpose. We have already alluded to the prayer of the Bishop of Carthage, that infidels might be converted, and that such as believed might persevere unto the end; from which words Augustine infers that this pious prelate *must* have held his sentiments respecting Election and Reprobation. Gregory, again, exhorting his flock to confess the Trinity in unity, assured them that “He who enabled them, in the first instance, to believe that doctrine, would in due time also give them power to confess it.” Therefore, the Bishop of Hippo concludes that his views of Predestination and Election must have been held by Nazianzen. Finally, Ambrose argued that when a man became a Christian, he might fairly allege his own good pleasure in so doing, without in any wise denying the good pleasure of God; “for it is from God that the will of man is prepared; and Christ calls him whom he pities.” From this statement it is concluded by Augustine, that the writer of it must have embraced notions similar to his own, on the decrees of God and the destiny of man.

But another passage has been cited from the same author, which, dislocated from the text, and considered without respect to the avowed sentiments of Ambrose, may seem at first to be somewhat more pertinent. This learned Father, commenting on a remark made incidentally by St. Luke, expresses himself as follows:—"Learn also that Christ would not be received by those who, he knew, had not been converted in simplicity of mind. For if he had so pleased, he might, from being undevout, have made them devout. But why they did not receive him the evangelist himself shows us, when he says, 'because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem. For the disciples were wishing to be received into Samaria.' God calleth those whom he designs to call; and him whom he willeth he makes religious."

"On this insulated passage, associated with that which I have already noticed as being perfectly inapposite and impertinent, rests Augustine's entire proof, that Ambrose agreed with him in his peculiar views of Election and Reprobation. For let it not be forgotten that the challenge of the Massilean Christians to Augustine was, not to demonstrate by evidence the primitive antiquity of the doctrines of Grace, but to demonstrate by evidence the primitive antiquity of his own well-defined specialties. Nor even in the place before us, nakedly standing as it does, I know not that Ambrose says any thing to which a sound maintainer of the vital doctrines of Free Divine Grace and Corrupt Human Insufficiency would not readily subscribe. A Calvinist or Austinist, no doubt, would of course assent. But it by no means *therefore* follows, that every one who does assent, stands thereby pledged to be a Calvinist or an Austinist. The propriety of this remark, which obviously involves the evidential irrelevancy of the present citation, will soon appear, if quitting our insulated and doctrinally indefinite passage, we simply and briefly compare the system of Augustine with the *real* sentiments of Ambrose, as from his own writings those sentiments may be readily collected.

"Augustine taught the *absolute Election of certain individuals to Eternal Salvation*. In other words, Augustine taught that God has irrevocably elected certain individuals to eternal salvation, simply *because* such a proceeding seemed good to his sovereign will and pleasure. Ambrose taught the *conditional* election of the Gentiles into the pale of the visible Church. In other words, Ambrose taught that God has elected certain individuals out of the great mass of the unbelieving Gentiles into the pale of the visible Church, *because* he foresaw the future merits and fitness of those individuals. Whence he consistently maintained that the character of an Elect Race, a Royal Priesthood, a Holy Nation, an Adopted People belongs in common to all the members of the visible Church Catholic. Such were the respective systems of Augustine and Ambrose. No two Theological Schemes, I apprehend, whether in point of *ideality* or in point of *causation*, can well be more different; and I must say that Augustine's adduction of Ambrose as an authority for his

own peculiar views of Election, is, if we be charitably willing to exempt him from the charge of intentional disingenuousness, at the least, strangely nugatory and irrelevant."

It is amusing to see how Calvin avails himself of the device practised by his great master, the Bishop of Hippo-Regius, for gaining to his cause the weight of Ambrose's name. He does not, indeed, venture to appeal to any writer older than Augustine, and even seems quite sensible that two out of the three authors quoted by this Father are nothing to the purpose. With his eyes open to all the advantages and importance of having antiquity on his side for aiding him in the establishment of his hypothesis, he nevertheless relinquishes Cyprian and Gregory. He saw clearly that his predecessor in the doctrine of Christian fatalism, had laid hold of these commentators as a drowning man catches at a straw, and therefore he himself makes no mention of them. But he seizes the alleged evidence of the Bishop of Milan, and uses it, too, with much more complacency than fairness. Let the testimony of Augustine, says he, avail with those who willingly acquiesce in the authority of the Fathers: although Augustine does not suffer himself to be disjoined from the rest: but by clear testimonies shows that any such discrepance from them as that with the odium of which the Pelagians attempted to load him, is altogether false. For out of Ambrose he cites *Christus, quem misereatur, vocat*. Item, *Si voluisset, ex indevotis fecisset devotos*. *Sed Deus, quos dignatur, vocat; et, quem vult, facit religiosum*.

In this statement there is, as our author well remarks, double dishonesty. Calvin assures those who are inclined to build on the authority of the Fathers, that Augustine is not disjoined from the rest; and that he was never accused of any discrepancy from the current of primitive belief except by those heretics the Pelagians. By the former assertion he unquestionably meant to insinuate that all antiquity, up to the Apostolic age, spoke the language and advocated the peculiarities of Augustine; and by the latter, he more covertly conveys the impression that the only charge brought against his favourite author, as an innovator on evangelical truth, was made by a sect whose errors he had exposed and whose resentment it was an honour to have incurred. Now, it assuredly requires no small portion of that charity which thinketh no evil to acquit the Geneva professor of intentional misrepresentation. He was perfectly aware, while he claimed for the African prelate a concurrence in opinion with all the more ancient Fathers of the Church, that not one of them, with the exception of Ambrose, could be shown to have written a single sentence capable of being even twisted into a conformity with his daring novelties. And

when he referred to the Pelagians as attempting to load the bishop with the odium of singularity, of standing alone in the wide field of Christian learning and faith, and of having no example or support during the lapse of four hundred years, he could hardly be ignorant that the persons who really did remind Augustine that he was bringing new things to light, were those orthodox servants of Christ, who extolled his zeal and magnified his triumph in his contest with the disciples of Pelagius! Calvin, we fear, is in this instance justly chargeable with an artful misrepresentation of the truth.

The fruitless attempt to press Ambrose into the service of a cause to which his general sentiments were greatly opposed, seems on some occasions to have thrown back Augustine on his own resources, and to have drawn from him the acknowledgment that his theory of Redemption was really new. So far from maintaining that his notions on the subject of Election had descended to him from antiquity through the medium of his professional instructors in the Faith, he states that he had himself diligently searched out and discovered it. He owns there was a time when he had not attained to the knowledge of the truth according to his peculiar views; when he neither made the search nor the discovery; and consequently he conducts his readers to the inference that there was a time when he maintained an entirely different system. Now, it is manifest that this never could have happened, if from the first his theory of belief as to Predestination and Election had always been the one generally recognized by the Catholic Church.

The modesty, reserve, or polemical skill of Calvin have not been exhibited by all his followers in modern times. Seeing that the founder of his faith had appealed without reason to Cyprian and Gregory, he passed them by in his review of ancient authorities. But Mr. Milner, in a certain part of his *Church History*, strengthens the ranks of Austinism by dragging to its banners two ancient writers whose opinions have never been considered as in the slightest degree allied to those first promulgated at Hippo-Regius. We allude to Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch, who are represented by this semi-Calvinist as having paved the way for the introduction of that sound creed which was fully matured in the sixteenth century on the banks of the Leman Lake. We are assured by Mr. Milner that the strictly primitive Church, which received her theology immediately from the lips of the Apostles, held the doctrine of Election as that doctrine has been subsequently explained by Augustine and Calvin. In support of this bold asseveration he gives from St. Clement the following paraphrase. "Let us go to Him in sanctification of heart, lifting up

holy hands to Him, influenced by the love of our gracious and compassionate Father, who by *his election hath made us his peculiar people*. Since therefore we are the *elect of God*, holy and beloved, let us work the works of holiness." The original terms do not in all respects bear out the translation, as will be seen by comparing  $\delta\varsigma \epsilon\kappa\lambdaογῆς \muέρους \epsilon\piοίησεν \epsilon\alphaυτῶ$ , with "who by his election hath made us his peculiar people." Still, it is maintained that the doctrine of Election runs remarkably through it. The passage from Ignatius is the address or salutation contained in his letter to the Church of Ephesus, which he there describes as predestinated before the world,  $\pi\rho\delta \alpha\iota\omega\omega\upsilon\omega\upsilon$ , to permanent and unchangeable glory, and elect by the will of the Father and Jesus Christ our God. From this address Mr. Milner concludes that the "Ephesian Christians had still maintained their character for Evangelical purity; that the very titles by which they are accosted by the Bishop of Antioch demonstrate what their faith was in common with that of the whole church at that period; and abundantly show the vanity of those whose dislike of the peculiar truths of Christianity induces them to suppose that the ideas of Predestination, Election and Grace were purely the systematic inventions of Augustine and were unknown to the primitive Christians." He adds, "we are certain that St. Paul's Epistles, and particularly the one addressed to this Church, are full of the same things."

Now, from these extracts we may learn, if we knew it not before, that Clement and Ignatius use the terms "predestinate," "elect," and "election;" but in what particular *sense* they use them, remains still to be determined. That they are employed by these primitive writers in the Calvinistic acceptation is assumed, indeed, by Mr. Milner; and then the assumption is farther extended into the semblance of an historical evidence; whence, in the third place, a corollary is derived that the Augustinian doctrine of Election was, from the very beginning, taught by Clement of Rome as the familiar and universally received tenet of the earliest Catholic Church. It is ascertained by Mr. Faber, that in the Epistle of the Bishop of Rome to the Corinthians, the terms in question occur only nine times; and by weighing their import, with a due reference to the context and to the main object which the author had in view, it is made perfectly manifest that in his hands, they had not the meaning which was afterwards assigned to them by the founder of the school of Hippo-Regius. The latter set forth as an institute of the Christian religion, the sovereign election to eternal life of certain individuals, not only out of the unbelieving world at large, but likewise out of the various members of the visible Church itself.



But Clement, by the very form of his language, shows us that he considered *all* the members collectively, both of the Church of Rome and of the Church of Corinth, to be a part of the great body of God's elect: for, be it observed, the epistle is addressed to the *whole* Church of Corinth in the name of the *whole* Church of Rome; and the plural terms *we* and *us* abundantly indicate that in his sense of the word, the term *elect* was descriptively appropriate to *every* member of the Church Catholic. Such an extension of the word precludes the supposition that the companion and fellow-labourer of the Apostles could understand by election a direct and irreversible determination to eternal life; for, had he so understood it, he must have believed, what yet he could not have believed, that not a single member of the Church universal would perish. Election, in his eyes, was not an infeasible admission to the kingdom of heaven, but an adoption through Christ to be a peculiar people as the Israelites were adopted collectively to be a peculiar people. "Hence," he says, addressing the whole body of the Corinthians, "let us therefore approach unto the Lord in holiness of soul, lifting up to him holy and unpolluted hands, loving our clement and merciful Father, who hath made us unto himself a part of the election." For thus it is written: "When the Most High divided the nations, as he scattered the sons of Adam, he appointed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the angels. Then his people Jacob became the portion of the Lord, Israel the lot of his inheritance." And, in another place, he says, "Behold, the Lord taketh unto himself a nation from the midst of the nations, as a man taketh the first fruits of his threshing-floor; and out of that nation shall come the Holy of Holies. Wherefore, since *we are made a part of the Holy One*, let us do all those things that pertain unto holiness."

From this statement it is manifest, beyond all reasonable contradiction, that, according to the views of St. Clement, the election propounded in the Gospel was the same as the election of the Israelites under the law to be God's peculiar people, as distinguished from the various nations of the pagan world, which were pretermitted or passed by. The same conclusion may be drawn from the language and reasoning of Ignatius, into whose mind the Augustinian notion of predestination seems never once to have entered.

It has been remarked that, in one particular only, is there any semblance of disagreement between the Bishop of Hippo and the President of Geneva, the doctrine, namely, of Regeneration. Calvin held, that the grace of regeneration is granted *solely* to the elect, and consequently maintained, that those who are regene-

rated *cannot* finally fall away to perdition. The other taught that *all* infants are regenerated in baptism: and because persons baptized in their infancy may perish, he likewise taught that the regenerate may finally fall away to their everlasting ruin. The former regarded regeneration as a *moral* change of disposition, superadded to a *federal* change of condition; and this he understood to take place in the elect, and in the elect only, at the time of their effectual calling. But the latter, in the case of infants, viewed regeneration only as a beneficial change of relative condition; in other words, as removing the imputed guilt of original sin, and as bringing them out of the wilderness of the unbelieving world into the pale, and covenanted privileges, of Christ's Church. Yet, since, in his opinion, and in necessary accordance with his train of reasoning, regeneration, in the case of infants, neither is nor can be a moral change of disposition, he thence contended, that although all baptized infants must be accounted regenerate, still, in order to their salvation, they must at some time *after* their baptism, experience that moral change of disposition which hitherto they have not experienced. Now, to use Mr. Faber's argument as applicable to this case, as all who are to be saved must, at some period or another, experience this moral change, which Augustine denominates conversion; and since, in the bishop's view of the matter, infants do not experience this change in their baptismal regeneration, indispensable though it be to their eternal welfare; he must necessarily be understood as teaching that the regenerate, in *his* sense of the word, may fall away irretrievably, and thus finally perish. In effect, therefore, though the notions of Augustine may at first sight appear to be more sound than those of Calvin, they differ not materially; and, in both, the source of error is the same, a want of attention to the primitive doctrines of the Church relative to regeneration and election.

It is well observed, by an able writer, that the matters which come under our especial consideration as Christians, are not the naked offspring of human reason, exercising itself upon the subjects which concern its eternal interests, but are truths revealed to us by God himself, with this especial promise, that he will be with his Church in all ages, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the *great* truths of the Gospel. It therefore becomes of unspeakable importance, that we should know *what* truths have been held by the Church in *all* ages, because their general acceptance, combined with the remembrance of God's promise, makes them binding on us. Whatever in religion is *new*, is, *eo nomine*, *false*. Whatever in the strict sense of the word is *old*, that is, what has been handed down from the Apos-

tolic times through the lapse of ages to us, that is, *eo nomine, true*.\*

As neither Calvinism nor Arminianism derives any countenance from primitive antiquity, it became an important question to ascertain what were the precise notions attached to the term election in the days of the Apostolic Fathers. Proceeding on the analogy of Scripture, both of the Old Testament and the New, there can be no doubt that this expression was applied to the choice of certain individuals out of all nations, to constitute the visible Church of God, and to enjoy the privileges connected with this holy vocation; and farther, that such choice was made with the merciful purpose that, through faith and holiness, they should attain to everlasting life, though not exempted from the hazard of failing, owing to their neglect or perverseness to make their calling and election sure. As this principle is not limited to one peculiar lineage, but extends to all men, it is by Mr. Faber denominated Nationalism; a term founded on the usage of Mr. Locke and his followers, who have not sufficiently restricted the import of their language, with regard to what our author would call the ideality of election. Mr. Faber has, accordingly, substituted the phrase "ecclesiastical individualism," implying that individuals, not whole nations, were chosen to become members of the Church. For instance, as he observes, the early Christians supposed not the Greeks *collectively* to be an elected nation, as contradistinguished from other nations, which were not elected; but they viewed as the elect *among* the Greeks those individuals who, obeying the Gospel call, had become members of the Church of Christ, whether seated at Corinth, or at Ephesus, Colosse, Philippi, or Thessalonica. Hence they esteemed the Catholic Church at large to be the Church of the Election, as comprehending the whole body or people of the elect gathered individually out of every nation upon the face of the earth.

From this view of the grounds on which the distinction inculcated by Mr. Faber is founded, it is manifest, and is indeed freely acknowledged, that in certain cases, individualism gradually becomes equivalent to nationalism, though it may be doubted whether, in point of fact, any such instance has ever yet occurred. In strictness of speech, it is maintained that ecclesiastical individualism can never merge in nationalism until we shall behold a nation, every individual of which has become a member of the Catholic Church, and not a single person remains without its pale, either as an infidel or a heretic. For, since an election into the Church of Christ constitutes the true meaning of scrip-

\* The Study of Church History recommended, &c. By Hugh James Rose, B.D.

tural election, it is obvious that neither an infidel nor a heretic can be consistently deemed to have been thus elected; or at least, if in the first instance they were thus elected, they plainly must be viewed as having deliberately *renounced* the privileges of their election. To say those who professedly belong not to the Church are yet members of the Church of the Election, is a palpable contradiction in terms.

This, according to Mr. Faber, is the ideality of election—the gift or benefit comprehended in the vocation wherewith all Christians are called. But what, in the next place, is the moving cause in the Divine Mind, or the reason why some are called and others pretermitted? No other reason can be assigned than the sovereign will of God—the principle on which Jacob was chosen and Esau passed by. St. Clement, desirous to assign a motive for the election of such as should constitute the Church in various ages, refers to the foreknowledge of God, severing the good from the bad, choosing the former and rejecting the latter. But, in opposition to this hypothesis, it is argued that, were the foresight of man's righteousness the ground of election, there would be no wicked person within the pale of the Christian communion. The existence of bad men in the Church would involve a contradiction in terms, were the foreknowledge of virtue and holiness, in all cases, the true ground of their admission to the blessings of the covenant of grace.

The general question being settled, it remains to be determined what are the real doctrines of the Church of England on the important heads of Predestination and Election. With modern Calvinists it is not uncommon, as our author remarks, to claim the Anglican Church as their own, *de jure*, if not *de facto*; and the proof or basis on which they found their claim is the seventeenth article. The most satisfactory reason that can be assigned for the groundlessness of this opinion is the simple fact, that when the Articles were composed, the doctrines of Calvin were hardly known in this country, because the work in which he advocated his peculiar dogmas was published only the year before the Articles appeared. In 1551, Cranmer received a command to prepare a Book of Articles, which, when completed, were, the same year, submitted to the bishops. In May, 1552, they were laid before the privy council; and in the following September they were revised, arranged in a somewhat different order, received titles which had not been previously affixed to them, and were, moreover, considerably augmented. Thus improved, they were finally returned to the privy council in November; and in the early part of the year 1553, they were ratified and published.

Now Calvin's controversy on the subject of Predestination did not commence until the close of the year 1551; and his first treatise on that subject, intituled *De Æterna Dei Prædestinatione*, was not published, even at Geneva, till the month of January, 1552. Hence it is manifest, that the seventeenth article, as originally drawn up and communicated to the bishops in the year 1551, cannot, by any possibility, have been borrowed from Calvin. Nor, for the same reason, can it be said directly to contradict the notions of Calvin on Predestination; but all the torture in the world cannot make it assert his doctrine. The utmost which can be said is, that while the former part holds *some* doctrine, relating to *some* predestination, the latter part is very vehement against some notions on the same subject. But bring the proper light to the article, and it does not remain, as no true Christian could ever believe it would, in this discreditable state of mist and darkness. The proper meaning is to be drawn from the works of the schoolmen, to which several of the articles were opposed. Those ingenious speculators held the doctrine—not that God, as Calvin said, foredoomed some from eternity to weal and some to woe, without consideration of their characters—but that he first foresaw what each individual would be, and so foreknew, and then and therefore foredoomed him accordingly. Now it is this doctrine which our article directly, clearly, and strongly opposes. The schoolmen teach the predestination of individuals. The article, on the contrary, teaches the predestination of the whole body of the faithful, and speaks of it as of the highest comfort, as beyond all doubt it is, that God, of his infinite mercy, foredoomed, before the foundations of the world were laid, that all who accept the Gospel Covenant shall be rescued from the curse; shall have all done for them which is necessary for their salvation, by the free mercy of God; and after a life spent in his service here, shall enter into his glory hereafter. Great comfort it is, indeed, as the article teaches, to those who feel that they are, by God's grace, living as becomes Christians,—to know that by his *covenant*, made before the world began, the everlasting glory of such as die in this faith, is sure and certain. Having established this point, the predestination of *all* faithful believers by covenant, the article goes on to warn all men against the evil which must arise from having before their eyes the sentence of predestination as respects themselves, and to show them how certainly such a course must lead either to carelessness in vice or to desperation. It concludes with one of those gentle and calm displays of quiet wisdom which are the glory and blessing of our Church. Knowing how fruitless it is for man to speculate on free-will and predestination, as respects *individuals*, and having

given its warning against the vain attempt, it reminds us that it is our duty and our wisdom (without coming to any decision on what in theory it is impossible, and in practice useless, to know) to take God's promises as they are set forth to us in Scripture, by them to regulate our lives, and to leave our eternal interests in the hands of Him who loves us with a love passing the love of any earthly parent, and desires above all things to bring *all* his children to his home and his bosom.\*

But the view now given is greatly confirmed by the circumstance, well established by Mr. Faber, that if Cranmer was in any degree influenced by the advice of the German reformers, it was to Melancthon he paid the respect of asking counsel. It is clear that the archbishop had consulted him on some point connected with the decrees of God; and the conclusions to which he had now arrived are abundantly manifest from the nature of his answer—"A manifold variety of explications have been and still are excogitated, merely because simple and sincere antiquity is neglected. I beg therefore that you would deliberate with good and really learned men, what great need there is of caution and moderation in formally expressing any decision. At the commencement of our Reformation the Stoical Disputations among our people concerning Fate were very horrible; and these debates did much mischief to discipline. Hence I request that you would think well respecting any such formula of doctrine."

When the Reformation began, Melancthon himself had, in common with most others, embraced the repulsive doctrine of Absolute Predestinarian Fatalism; but he appears to have abandoned it so early as the year 1527, and after the diet of Augsburg, in the year 1530, it was no more heard of. At all events, in the year 1529, he had not only given up but even strongly repudiated that doctrine; a fact which is proved by a letter written by him shortly before his death to Stathmio, wherein he states that he had relinquished all such opinions thirty years ago. Accordingly, though he had introduced the tenet into his *Loci Theologici*, he afterwards, in the edition of 1535, wholly expunged it; and from that date expressed his rooted abhorrence of it in the very strongest terms. Suffice it to mention, with regard to the subject in hand, that Melancthon had renounced the dogma of predestinarian fatalism long before he was consulted by the English primate on the doctrine of the seventeenth article. We have seen, too, that while he laments the mischief which had accrued to the Reformation, at its early stage in Germany, from what he calls Stoical Disputations concerning Fate, he strongly

\* Rose's Study of Church History.

dissuades the archbishop from introducing any such speculations into those authorized documents of the Anglican Church, which were then about to be prepared; advising him rather, in order to obtain sound information on the subject, to turn towards that simple and sincere antiquity which had been too long and too much neglected. Nor can it be said of him, that while he rejected Manichæan fatalism, he retained those views of predestination and election which were held by Augustine: for, to the great annoyance of Calvin, he rejected with equal abhorrence the doctrines of that divine, as being the very system which he had renounced under the name of Stoical Necessity. He even proceeded so far as to style Calvin himself the Zeno of Geneva; reprobating, in strong terms, the violence he had used towards his opponent Bolsec, whom, for his opposition to the tenet of divine decrees, he had banished from the republic.\*

But, as is well known, the seventeenth article has never been satisfactory to the Calvinists of this country, for though it does speak of predestination, it gives no countenance to the notion of a fixed irreversible election of certain individuals to eternal life. Of this defect, as Mr. Faber observes, the Calvinizing party, which, toward the end of the reign of Elizabeth, and the beginning of the reign of her successor, James, had great weight in the Church of England, were perfectly aware, and laboured hard to repair it.

Accordingly in the year 1595, Dr. Whitaker, the very able leader of the Calvinistic party at Cambridge, clearly enough perceiving the deficiency of the seventeenth Article as given in the years 1552 and 1562, drew up, as an explanation of it, those nine subsidiary Articles, which, from the circumstance of their having been composed at the Archbishop's Palace, are usually styled the *Lambeth Articles*, and which no doubt most abundantly supplied that deficiency. Of these nine articles the four first were couched in the following terms, which explicitly define both the *idea* and the *cause* to be the very idea and the very cause which are propounded in the Calvinistic system.

1. From eternity God predestinated some to life, and reprobated others to death.
2. Of predestination to life, the moving or efficient *cause* is not a prevision of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing inherent in predestinated persons, but the sole will of the good pleasure of God.
3. The number of the predestinated is predefined and certain; which number can neither be increased nor diminished.

\* On this ground, Mr. Faber as well as Mr. Rose follow Archbishop Lawrence.

4. They who are not predestinated to salvation, will necessarily be condemned on account of their sins.

It is well known that these, with the five remaining Articles, were never received by the Church, though various attempts were made to introduce them as an authoritative explanation of the seventeenth. At all events the desire to have them engrafted on the creed of the nation, shows clearly that the Calvinists were not satisfied with the form in which their favourite doctrines were promulgated by Cranmer and his colleagues. Indeed, with respect to the Articles generally they were very little pleased; complaining that they *speak very dangerously of falling from grace*; an error, said they, *which is to be reformed*.

No one who is acquainted with the history of our Articles will claim for them a Calvinistic origin or import; and all who have read Mr. Faber's book must have found reason to be satisfied that the doctrine held by our Church, on predestination and election, coincides perfectly with the belief of primitive times relative to these fundamental tenets. On the same grounds and by a similar process of reasoning it might be shown that the Articles are not Arminian. The seventeenth in particular is, when properly construed, not less opposed to the school of Leyden than to that of Geneva; rejecting, on either hand, the unalterable destination of individuals by a decree of heaven, to the enjoyment of eternal happiness, whether as founded on the foreknowledge of a fruitful faith, or on the absolute pleasure of the Almighty. We are reminded in it, that, though the decrees of predestination be unknown to us, yet must we receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scripture; and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.

We are much pleased with the observations of Mr. Faber on the phrase "generally set forth." The import of the *generally* is, he suspects, very often and very widely misapprehended by the readers of the seventeenth Article as it occurs in the English form. The term is thought to be equivalent to *usually*, or for *the most part*; and thence the clause is supposed to teach that in the matter of election, God's promises must be received as they are most *usually* set forth in Scripture, so that in the interpretation of holy writ we must not set up one text in opposition to another text. But this is in no wise either the meaning of the term or the drift of the clause. From its ambiguity, the word *generally* has, no doubt, been infelicitously selected; but a moment's inspection of the Article in its Latin form will show us the true import of the term. Its sense is not *generally* as opposed to *unusually*, but *generally* as opposed to *particularly*: it is *gene-*



*raliter*, in Latin, not *plerumque*. Had the word *generically* been used in the English form, all ambiguity would have been avoided; and thus the real drift of the clause would have stood out plain and distinct. The latter part of the Article is an explanation of its former part. We must embrace the doctrine of the *predestination to life*; but then as that predestination through the *medium* of election into the Church Catholic, is, so far as respects particulars or individuals, only according to God's moral purpose and intention, the promises of God in regard to predestination and election, must be received *generically* not *specifically*. That is to say, the promises of God must be received *generically*, with a reference to the *whole collective Church of the Election*, which Christ has founded on a rock, and which can never be finally overturned: not received specifically with a reference to a *certain number of individuals of that Church*, whose particular predestination to life might thence be erroneously pronounced absolute and irreversible. In this explanation, furnished by the Article itself, we may plainly, in its very phraseology, detect the assisting hand of Melancthon; and where his hand is detected, we can never doubt the real meaning. In precise correspondence to his language and to its own self-explanation of the use of the word *generically*, the Article, throughout its entire composition, employs a phraseology, not singular or *particular*, but plural or *generical*. It teaches, for instance, *every* member of the Church to speak of the godly consideration of an election; and in the Latin form, though in the English exhibition of the Article the phraseology has been departed from, it farther teaches all the members of the Church to say that this godly consideration doth greatly confirm *our* faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, and doth vehemently kindle our love towards God. Now, such pluralizing language, thus put into the mouth of *every* member of the Church, would palpably be improper, unless the author of the Article, like his friend and adviser Melancthon, had held and taught that in *his* sense of the word every member of the Church Catholic, or the Church of the Election, is himself one of the elect of God.

Concerning the opinion of Melancthon himself, and the influence which his judgment exercised over the English primate, there is nowhere any doubt. "Et si alia subtiliter de electione disputari fortasse possunt, tamen prodest piis tenere quod *promissio sit universalis*." Whatever subtilty of disputation there may be concerning the doctrine of election, it will profit the pious to hold that the *promise is universal*. Nor ought we, he continues, to judge of the will of God any otherwise than according to his revealed word; and we ought to know that God has commanded

us to believe. We, therefore, in all simplicity interpret the declaration *universally*, God willeth all men to be saved; that is to say, He wills the salvation of all men, so far as his purpose or intention is concerned. “*Nos igitur simpliciter interpretamur hanc sententiam universaliter, Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri; scilicet, quod ad ipsius voluntatem attinet.*”

The doctrine of Melancthon and of the Church of England, that the scriptural promises of God must be understood generically and not particularly, stood so directly opposed to the tenets of Calvin, that we cannot wonder at his specific resistance to it in set terms. “*Aliquid disserui, eorum errorem refellens, quibus generalitas promissionum videtur æquare totum genus humanum,*” said the angry disputant, alluding, it is probable, to the milder and more orthodox system of the author of the Augsburg Confession.

Our limits will not allow us to follow Mr. Faber through the remainder of the ninth chapter of his second book, in which he illustrates with great success the important position that the other authorized documents of our Church corroborate the interpretation he has given of the seventeenth Article. He shows that the doctrine of election held by the Anglican Establishment, is the choice of certain individuals into the pale of the visible Church, with God’s purpose, will, or intention, that, profiting by their privileges, they should finally be saved: holding, at the same time, the moral possibility of those elect persons so falling away from grace as finally and irrevocably, through their own perverseness, to perish; and that, farther, in strict accordance with God’s promises as they are generically set forth in Scripture, she holds the doctrine of universal as opposed to particular or limited redemption.

It has been urged by Calvinists that every Christian who reflects seriously must, in effect, adopt their sentiments, because, except on the plan of an assured and irreversible election to eternal glory, no person can feel any solid comfort or satisfaction in his own state; because, in short, no person can say whether he attains to the requisite standard of holiness, or whether after all, he may not finally fall away to perdition. But it is well observed in reply that such a statement as this can never, in the very nature of things, be made to bear on the simple question of the truth or falsehood of a doctrine. In other words, no inward feeling of the *comfort* of being irreversibly elected to eternal happiness can by any conceivable possibility establish the actual existence of such a plan of Election. Those pious individuals who employ such language unconsciously confound together two points which in themselves are essentially different and distinct: namely, the abstract *truth* of the Calvinistic doctrine of election, and the as-

sumed *certainty* that he who maintains the truth of that doctrine is himself one of the elect. On the ground that these two points coincide, is founded the notion, that the Calvinistic tenets as to Predestination and Election must be the source of satisfaction to every true believer. But this assumption, it is obvious, rests on a mere fallacy; for even on the supposition that the doctrine of Calvinistic Election is scripturally true, it by no means follows that every person who receives it is therefore one of the elect. Yet it is quite clear that any comfort accruing to the individual *must* arise, not from his abstractedly holding the doctrine in question, but from his absolute certainty of his particular election to eternal life. How, then, is this absolute certainty to be attained? Can it be said that a mere belief in the abstract truth of the doctrine conveys the certainty of the believer's *own* irreversible election to eternal glory? This will not, we presume, be anywhere maintained.

Again, then, it may be asked, how is a disciple of the Genevan school to know assuredly that he is one of the elect? It will be replied, perhaps, that he knows this fact from the conformity of his heart and conduct with the requisitions of God's holy word. But, as Mr. Faber sensibly remarks, if we be finally brought to *such* an answer, it is difficult to comprehend what *greater* comfort can be held out by Calvinism than by Anti-calvinism. For a Calvinist may be just as much racked with doubt, whether from his heart, his life and conversation, he has sufficient evidence that he himself is one of the elect, as an Anti-calvinist may be as to the sufficiency of similar evidence that he is indeed a child of God. In short Calvinism can afford no peculiar comfort to any individual, unless he be assured that he is himself infallibly elected to eternal salvation; and that such an assurance must flow, not from a bare speculative belief in a particular scheme of theology, but from a conscious conformity of the heart and life with the revealed word of God; the Spirit itself, from such conformity, bearing witness with his spirit that he is a child of God. "If *without* that conformity, a man deem himself one of the elect *merely* because he has an internal *feeling* that this is the case, such an individual may well be a subject of our hearty intercessory *prayer*, but he has placed himself out of the pale of any *reasoning* founded upon Scripture."—p. 200.

In the course of this learned work the author has successfully established the following positions; namely, that the primitive doctrine of Election was neither Calvinistic nor Arminian, but the choice of certain individuals to the privileges and hopes of the Gospel; and also that the views entertained on this important tenet by our Church strictly coincide with the opinions held

during the early and purest ages of the faith. He has proved, by a careful examination of historical records and professional treatises, that, prior to the days of Augustine, there was no stumbling-block in the way of the plain Christian, as to the rule of life or the ground of hope after death; and that no one had as yet ventured to teach any other species of Predestination than such as was inculcated by St. Paul and received by the Apostolic Fathers. He has shown that, in primitive times, every professing member of the visible Church of Christ was one of the elect in the original and proper sense of the term; a truth which he illustrates beautifully by a reference to our Liturgy, both in the daily service and occasional offices. We pray that the infant newly baptized may remain in the number of God's faithful and *elect* children: and we also pray to our holy and most merciful Saviour, that most worthy Judge Eternal, to suffer us not at our last hour, for any pains of death, *to fall from him*. The indefectible purpose, the irreversible decree, the seal of heaven fixing from all eternity the weal or woe of every human being, were unknown to Clement, Ignatius, Justin and Irenæus, and indeed to all the writers of the three first centuries.

It may not be unsuitable to notice that Augustine was almost entirely ignorant of the Greek language, without a competent knowledge of which no one can be held qualified to expound the Scriptures. Gibbon remarks that the superficial learning of the Bishop of Hippo was confined to the Latin tongue; that he disliked and neglected the study of Greek; that he boldly sounded the dark abyss of grace, predestination, free will, and original sin; but that his "orthodoxy was derived from the Manichæan school." These circumstances would of themselves diminish our confidence in the deductions of Augustine, even though he did not stand alone among the Christian commentators of antiquity.

We leave Mr. Faber's book, and pass on to the other mentioned at the head of this article, which professes to treat of the same subject, though, it will soon appear, in a manner as different as possible. The former appeals to Church History as the ground of its decisions; the latter invites its reader to consult his own feelings, to weigh the matter *in foro conscientiæ*, to listen to the judgment of the inner man, to ponder the dictates of the heart, assuring him, if he does so, that he will no longer repose his belief in Calvinistic Election.

Mr. Erskine has long enjoyed a high reputation in a certain section of the theological world as a zealous advocate of those opinions which distinguish the followers of the late Mr. Irvine. His several treatises, some of which have been noticed in this journal, indicate a strong and settled belief in the miracles

said to have been performed in the North, and even in the supernatural gift of tongues. But a more dispassionate study of the principles and facts to which he formerly yielded his conviction, has satisfied him that he was deceived; and accordingly, with that candour and love of truth which seem to pervade all the feelings of his heart, he now acknowledges that he had allowed himself to be misled, or, at all events, to adopt conclusions which his maturer thoughts refuse to sanction.

“ In two former publications of mine, the one entitled a ‘Tract on the Gifts of the Spirit,’ the other, ‘The Brazen Serpent,’ I have expressed my conviction that the remarkable manifestations which I witnessed in certain individuals in the West of Scotland, about eight years ago, were the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, of the same character as those of which we read in the New Testament. Since then, however, I have come to think differently, and I do not now believe that they were so. But I still continue to think that to any one whose expectations are formed by and founded on the declarations of the New Testament, the disappearance of those gifts from the Church must be a greater difficulty than their re-appearance could possibly be. I think it but just to add that though I no longer believe that those manifestations were the gifts of the Spirit, my doubts as to their nature have not at all arisen from any discovery, or even suspicion, of imposture in the individuals in whom they have appeared. On the contrary, I can bear testimony that I have not often in the course of my life, met with men more marked by native simplicity and truth of character, as well as by godliness, than James and George M'Donald, the two first in whom I witnessed those manifestations. Both these men are now dead, and they continued, I know, to their dying hour, in the confident belief that the work in them was of the Holy Ghost. I mention this for the information of the reader who may feel interested in their history, although it is a fact which does not influence my own conviction on the subject. To some it may appear as if I were assuming an importance to myself by publishing my change of opinion, but I am in truth only clearing my conscience, which requires me thus publicly to withdraw a testimony which I had publicly given, when I no longer believe it myself.”

Leaving the author to settle this case with his former friends, the believers in Mr. Irvine, we proceed to examine the grounds on which he has established his new faith as to the doctrine of Election. The result at which he arrives differs not essentially from that so ably recommended to our acceptance by Mr. Faber, though the medium whereby he has attained his end is, as we have already observed, totally unlike. He does not conceal that, for many years, he professed to hold the Calvinistic doctrine, modified, as he acknowledges, “very inconsistently,” by the belief of God’s love to all and of Christ having died for all; and yet when he looks back on the state of his mind, he now feels it would be

truer to say that he submitted to it rather than believed it. He submitted to it because he did not see how the language of the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans could bear any other interpretation: though all the while he could not help feeling that, on account of a few difficult passages, he was giving up the plain and obvious meaning of all the rest of the Bible, which, in the most unequivocal language and in every page, seems to say to every man, "See I have set before thee, this day, life and good, death and evil, therefore choose life that thou mayest live." He could not help feeling that if the Calvinistic hypothesis were well founded, then *that* on which a real and righteous responsibility in man can alone be founded, is wanting; and that the slothful servant had reason when, in vindication of his unprofitableness, he said, "I knew thee that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed." Above all, he could not help feeling that if God were such as the Calvinistic doctrine describes him, then the Creator of every man is not the friend of every man; and that when Christ was preached to sinners, the whole truth of God was not preached to them, for that there was something behind in the mind of God, giving the blessing to one and withholding it from another, so that the ministry of reconciliation was only an appendix to a deeper and more dominant ministry, in which the Almighty appeared simply as a sovereign without any moral attribute, and man was dealt with as a mere creature of necessity without any real responsibility. He relates that he was wont to rebuke the doubt of his heart by appealing to the words of Scripture, and especially by the consideration that the finite understanding of man was incapable of comprehending the infinite mind of God. But still he remained unsatisfied, because he met with passages in the Bible in which God invites and calls upon men to judge of the equality and righteousness of his ways, placing himself, as it were, at the bar of their consciences, and claiming from them a judgment testifying to his righteousness and clearing him of all inequality, and that, not on the ground that his righteousness is above their understanding, far less on the ground that he has a sovereign right to do as he pleases, but on the ground that his righteousness is such as men can judge of, and because it is clear and plain to that principle of judgment within them by which they approve or condemn their own actings and the actings of their fellow men.

Had Mr. Erskine, in this state of mind, been qualified, like Mr. Faber, to ascend to the high fountains of Christian antiquity, and to draw from them the pure and living water of truth, his anxiety would have vanished and all his difficulties would have been removed. He would have discovered that the irrational and unscrip-

tural system against which the simple feelings of nature had risen in rebellion, was not held by those earliest Fathers of the Church who received their teaching from the Apostles, and that no countenance can be claimed for it from the writings of any author of reputation during the first four hundred years after the era of Redemption. He would have found that Augustine, when he introduced his speculations on Predestination and Election, was charged with neologism; that the great body of the faithful rejected them; and, moreover, that his opinions on those profound inquiries have been ascribed to a species of philosophy which St. Paul described as science falsely so called.

The want of systematic learning betrays Mr. Erskine on many occasions, even where his views cannot be pronounced positively unsound, or in any great degree inconsistent with the analogy of faith. There is, besides, throughout his book a tendency to mysticism which sets at defiance all the ordinary rules of criticism, and laughs to scorn nearly all the received principles of interpretation. His appeals to the rational conscience and the inward light proceed too much on the ground that, in the exposition of Scripture, every man must be law unto himself; whence it might be inferred, by a rash or careless commentator, that the decisions of his own mind must be the ultimate test of truth. There is, moreover, in some places a bold innovation on the established modes of speech and meaning of words. For instance, he affixes to the phrase Natural Religion an import not only quite unjustified by the practice of good writers, but apparently inconsistent with the etymology of the terms. According to him, natural religion does not mean any thing that "man's own intellect imagines" or discovers of God and his relation to men; but only that inward knowledge of God and his purpose toward us that every human being gains or may gain by the striving and teaching of "the Spirit in his conscience." *Natural* religion, he maintains, is synonymous with *true* religion. It is not produced by that exercise of the intellect by which we trace effects to their causes, and thus arrive at a First Cause, which we call God; but it springs from a *real root in our nature*, so that the doctrines of it are believed not merely or chiefly on any outward authority whatever, nor on any process of reasoning whatever, but on the authority of an inward consciousness, in the same way as we believe that there is a God and that justice is right and injustice wrong. By the epithet *natural*, as used in this connection, he does not mean to refer to the source from which the suggestion of a doctrine first comes to us, but to the authority which finally seals it to us; and under this description of natural religion, he comprehends all doc-

trines which, though coming to us by external revelation, meet with or awaken the inward consciousness, and are thus known by us to be true on the authority of that consciousness. He opposes natural religion, not to revealed religion, but to what he calls "conventional religion"—that is, religion adopted on external authority, without any living consciousness within our hearts corresponding to it.

"Whilst a man is not feeling the voice in his conscience to be the voice of a Great Being who in this way comes near to him and desires to make Himself known to him, but is considering it and treating it as a part of himself, like his feelings of benevolence, or compassion, or regard for self-preservation, he may be acknowledging the truths of theological science, or of the Bible, and he may be ordering his conduct according to the received maxims of the age or country in which he happens to live: but he has not a religion which has a living root in his heart, he has a conventional and not a natural religion. He does not yet know God at first hand. The God of theology is a power or a principle, discerned by the intelligence through a logical process; the God of the conscience is a personal being, possessing a personal character, discerned by the conscience as light is by the eye. Those whose knowledge of God comes through theology often dispute as the Epicureans and others, whether there be such a thing as special providence, and whether it cares about the condition of individual men, and seeks the direction of their character and conduct; whereas those who know God through their consciences, begin with those very points as the grounds and elements of their religion, and as matters not of inference but of consciousness. But some one may here interrupt me and say, 'I have no consciousness of this within me, as you are pleased to call it, being any thing else than a part of my own nature, and especially I am not conscious of its proceeding from a Being distinct and separate from myself; and surely you have no right to make your own consciousness, or your imagined consciousness, a general standard of human consciousness, or as indicating a general fact with regard to the condition of men.' I answer that there are many things even in our physical constitution which whilst unattended to are not matters of consciousness, but which become so by being attended to. Thus the action of the stomach and of the heart, whilst we are occupied about other things, is not matter of consciousness to us in general. But if we read a book on the subject of these organs, and thus have our attention drawn to them, we gradually grow into a consciousness of their action. But this could not be, unless there were actually within us a dormant consciousness of this action prior to any such attention. Attention could not create that consciousness, it only awakens it."

This specimen may suffice to give the reader a notion of the ingenuity and perverseness of Mr. Erskine's reasoning. But when he restricts himself to the proper subject of election, he throws away his mysticism and argues with all the clearness and



vigour of a true philosopher. For example, his remarks on Edwards's theory of free will are at once judicious and conclusive, striking at the root of the absurd doctrine which the American divine endeavours to engraft on the pure stock of revelation. This author, as every one knows, considers all men, whilst unregenerated, as still standing in that state of helplessness into which Adam's fall brought human nature, and as being no otherwise affected by the redemption of Jesus Christ than as having been placed by it in such circumstances that God may now, consistently with justice, by a special act of grace, apply the benefits of it to such individuals as he chooses; but he sees no gift of spiritual light or life, given to them as a race, in Christ. He thus regards them all as born heirs of a nature possessed exclusively by a corrupt will, and as destitute of any means of resisting it; and of course he concludes that nothing but a new and special power acting upon them from without, can rescue them from that necessity of evil to which they are bound. This is Edwards's hypothesis as to man's condition, and he persuades himself, as he has succeeded in persuading many others, that this condition is consistent with a true liberty and responsibility, by adopting a definition of liberty which makes no reference whatever to the moral condition of man, and which therefore confounds his rational liberty with the unconscious liberty of a beast. We agree with Mr. Erskine in thinking, that Edwards's great success as a theological metaphysician, has arisen from the fact that this definition has been generally passed over uncriticised and unquestioned, and that the true answer to his book would consist in pointing out the incompleteness of the definition on which so much of his reasoning rests.

The definition now mentioned is as follows, "Liberty is the power or advantage that any one has to do or to conduct as he pleases." Now it is evident that this definition makes no reference to the moral condition of man, and in fact applies equally well to the liberty of a beast as to that of a man; for it requires nothing more in the subject than an inclination to act, and the power to act according to that inclination. Edwards avails himself, to the fullest extent, of the advantage which this definition gives him. He tests by it the condition of man such as the highest Calvinist supposes him to be, namely, destitute alike of all inclination and of all means to resist the power of evil; and because he finds that amidst all this destitution, there is still left him the inclination to do evil, and the power to act according to that inclination, he pronounces him as free as it is possible to conceive a creature to be, and of course thoroughly responsible.

By this definition, also, he proves the consistency of absolute unconditional decrees of election and reprobation with liberty and responsibility; because, notwithstanding the darkest of these decrees, the inclination and the power to do evil are still left to the reprobate. As therefore his whole demonstration of the consistency of the Calvinistic view of man's condition with liberty, rests on the accuracy of the definition, it will follow that if the definition be proved inadequate or faulty, the demonstration must fall to the ground. Mr. Erskine undertakes to accomplish this task, and on the ruins of the hypothesis which will be thereby overthrown, he hopes to establish a more reasonable principle; showing that the true notion of human liberty requires conditions utterly incompatible with the common doctrine of Election.

"If I wish," says he, "to remove an animal from one field to another, I have only to remove his food, and the animal follows his own natural impulse, and exercising 'the power to do as he pleases,' goes to the place which I have destined for him. According to Edwards's definition of liberty, this animal is perfectly free; but surely it is not free, with a liberty which we could consider suitable to a moral being. We cannot but see that the definition here proves itself to be too wide, because it lets things pass through it which ought not to pass through it; and that it is deficient in discrimination, because it makes no distinction between the blind liberty of a beast, and the rational liberty of a man; we cannot therefore be justified in placing any dependence upon it. But let us pursue this path a little further. In the same way that I manage this animal, a ruling man of governing talents may manage his fellow men, and without putting any constraint upon them, may make use of their appetites, and passions, and interests, so as to accomplish purposes by them of which they are perfectly ignorant, and in which they have no sympathy with him, but the contrary. They are thus blind, unconscious tools in his hands, and yet in all that they do, they only exercise 'their power or opportunity of doing as they please.' It is evident that neither the animal, nor men who are under such management, can properly be called free, because although they act according to their own purposes, they are unacquainted with the real dominant purpose which is to be fulfilled by their actings, and in subordination to which all their private purposes have been foreseen and arranged. So far, then, the animal and the men thus managed are on an equal footing with respect to liberty, or rather to bondage. But there is this difference between them, that the animal is incapable of any higher freedom than that which it has, whilst the men are. The animal is inca-

pable of entering into my purpose in wishing to remove it from one place to another, and therefore I cannot get it to become a co-operator with me, but am necessarily obliged to address to it a subordinate motive quite separate from my real purpose. Whereas the men are capable of entering into the purpose of their ruler, and if that purpose embraces their interests as well as his own, he may, by disclosing it to them, be delivered from the necessity of employing subordinate means to influence them, and may henceforth have the benefit of their exertions in the capacity of friends and coadjutors, instead of using them as unconscious instruments. If he succeed in this object, they will evidently become free in a sense in which they were not before—they become free in relation to him and to his purpose—for they are no longer used by him for the advancement of his purpose under the semblance and notion of advancing a purpose of their own, and they now act with a conscious view to that object which is the real ultimate object of their acting.”

The idea of liberty, of which we get a glimpse here, is, that it consists in a sympathy, or agreement of choice, with regard to the dominant purpose of our acting, with the ruling and directing mind which appoints our acting; and the capacity of liberty consequently consists in a capacity for such sympathy. We thus arrive at a principle which distinguishes the blind liberty of a beast from the rational and moral liberty of a man; and we cannot allow any definition of human liberty to be just and complete which does not embrace this principle. But in order more distinctly to understand the conditions which are necessary to this sympathy, and of course to moral liberty, let us suppose that the object which the imaginary ruling man has to accomplish through the instrumentality of his fellow men, is a purely selfish object, and directly opposed to the interests of those he is making use of to procure it; is it not evident that, in such circumstances, he never can by any disclosure of his purposes, gain their voluntary co-operation with him, inasmuch as they can never sympathize with him in that which they know to be hurtful to themselves? And hence it is also perfectly evident, that to subjects placed in such circumstances—that is, in a state of subjection to a ruler who has a design contrary to their good—rational liberty is impossible. But when we have once admitted the principle that, in order to be free, we must sympathize with our ruler in the dominant purpose which he has with regard to our actings, we must carry it to the Head of Creation; for it is evident that whilst there remains a ruler or a purpose more dominant than those with which we are acquainted, we are still in bondage. And before we can be truly

and essentially free, as moral and accountable beings, we must embrace the purpose entertained by the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and be animated with a desire to pursue it, as contributing at once to his glory and our ultimate good. If it be discovered that we have not such minds as are capable of entering into that purpose, then it is also discovered that we are incapable of moral freedom; and that, too, on the same ground as the supposed animal, led by its appetite from field to field, though our deficiency occurs at a higher part of the scale. Or, if it be discovered that the dominant purpose of the ruler is not for our advantage, and does not embrace our happiness, then it is at the same moment discovered that we are in circumstances in which it is impossible we can be free, because it is impossible that we can have sympathy with the ruler or in his purpose. It is obvious that this view of liberty completely does away with Edwards's attempt to prove that the theory of Calvinism is consistent with human liberty; his attempt, namely, to show that man is free, even on the supposition that he is lying under a degree of reprobation, and abandoned by God to the power of the evil spirit. His definition, in short, on which the whole scheme is founded, is a mere abstraction, which makes no reference either to the nature of man, or to his relation with God.

There is another objection to the Calvinistic hypothesis, which must occur even to the least reflecting, namely, that it is *impracticable*, considered either as a rule of life or ground of hope; and this bar to its reception is not in the smallest degree diminished by that modification of its general principles which found favour in the eyes of Baxter, Milner, and others of the same school. The Genevan system is complete and impregnable, if its basis be left unassailed. If the *postulata* be granted, the demonstration cannot be questioned, however inconsistent it may appear with the natural feelings of the human heart, or even with the main tenor of divine revelation. The Christian world is therefore greatly indebted to such writers as Mr. Faber, who show that Calvinism is a corruption of the pure faith once delivered to the Fathers; that it was unknown in the earliest ages of the Church; and that it effected not its entrance within the pale of the Catholic communion without a struggle on the part of the faithful, and an open protest that it was a bold innovation.

---

ART. III.—1. *The 51st Report of the Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday Schools throughout the British Dominions.* 1837.

2. *The 34th Annual Report of the Sunday School Union.* 1837.

3. *The 32d Report of the British and Foreign School Society.* 1837.

4. *The 26th Report of the National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales.* 1837.

5. *The 1st Annual Report of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society.* 1837.

6. *The 1st Publication of the Central Society of Education,* 1837—and, *Schools for the Industrious Classes, or the Present State of Education among the Working People of England,* published under the Superintendence of the Central Society of Education. 1837.

If diligent exertions and vehemence of declamation will ensure the success of the wishes of any party, we may shortly expect to witness a complete and fundamental change throughout the country in respect of educational affairs. But if solid facts and well grounded arguments are needful for the conviction of the public, and for bringing the sober-minded portion of the community to acquiesce in a mighty disturbance of existing institutions, and an experiment which cannot be divested of tremendous hazard, then, the day may yet be distant when the reformers of schools and schoolmasters shall see the fulfilment of their desires. This assertion is made with reference to grand and fundamental changes, such as are in agitation at the present moment, and not to that gradual improvement and extension of existing institutions, which we should be the first to hail with joy, and promote to the full extent of our powers.

We were ourselves of the number of those who thought not long ago that the signs of the times were indicative of a crisis and consummation in regard to the educational interests of the country most deeply to be deplored. The speeches of ministers, the hints thrown out by their acknowledged organs in the press, and the popular nature of a mighty cry which had been raised, (popular we mean among those who are to be captivated by pleasing and promising sounds,) made us suppose that government would come forward, in its own name, with some grand and comprehensive educational scheme. That henceforth the old machinery, (well as it had done its work considering the difficulty to be encountered,) was to be broken up and sold off, and a new patent apparatus of unheard-of powers to be introduced. And, what inference was more natural, when it was observed that the educa-

tion committees for England and Wales had apparently travelled out of their way both years of their sitting, and tacked on to the evidence, which was obtained in the usual manner, information procured by a different process, and favouring, if not actually announcing, the approaching change. We allude to the supplementary dissertation of Lord Brougham in 1834, sent in after he had seen the evidence of other witnesses, and the meetings of the committee were concluded; and to the evidence of Mr. J. Simpson during *seven* days before the committee on *education in Ireland*, in which the whole system of unsparing change in every department of education is detailed and advocated at great length; and the matter is (we had almost said) *summed up* thus:—(conclusion of 7th day.)

“And now that the country is under the operation of a new constitution, recognizing the right of the lower classes, in a greater degree than ever, to interfere in their self-government, do not you think that it is a matter no longer of choice, but actually incumbent upon an enlightened and patriotic ministry, as soon as possible, to take up this question of education, with a view to a legislative settlement?—I think that that course is no longer a matter of choice, it is a matter of stern necessity, and points out the only way in which we can expect to reap from the great measure of reform those national and social advantages which it is intended to produce: and we shall find that its working will be irritating, grating and unsatisfactory, till we shall see the day of a much greater diffusion of light, and knowledge, and morality than at present.

“At present a great portion of the population can read and write; and is it not to be apprehended that many of the evils which are dreaded from the diffusion of education are infinitely more probable from the sort of false or mis-education to which the lower classes of the people are exposed, than if an efficient and ameliorated system of education was put in action by the powers of the government and the people combined?—I have no doubt of it, &c.

“What then do you conceive to be the duty of the government and the legislature upon this subject?—I think their course is clear; legislation is forthwith required.

“In Ireland we have already considerable facilities for this purpose, in the establishment of such a board, and in the inclination which is evinced by their last Report of carrying out into effect one of the suggestions you have offered: would you not think that with such facilities before us, it would be a matter of great interest and duty, on the part of the government, to consolidate these advantages as soon as possible by a legislative measure?—I am persuaded that Ireland is in a position to make the great experiment effectually, and that the great *educational battle for England* and Scotland is to be fought there, &c. England and Scotland will see the great plan tried in Ireland, and I expect it will be so well and so effectively tried, that its direct transference to this country, making allowance for certain local peculiarities, will be matter of very easy legislation.”

But, it is one thing for the warrior to gird on his harness and make trial of the buckler and the shield, and another thing to go forth to try his weapons in the mortal struggle of the fight. And after all, though there were other matters besides those which are here referred to in support of the opinion we had adopted previously, we now apprehend that our conclusions were prematurely formed. A different course has been adopted already on the part of government, a course by which they appear to renounce all such hazardous enterprize. They have quietly suffered, or rather encouraged, the old champion to go forth to fight their battle in his own name; and he has manfully girded on his armour for the conflict—and there he is ready, if needful, to cover their own retreat. Moreover, there is not any thing now of that sanguine confidence and devoted ardour within the parliament which has been heard and witnessed without the walls of that house. And even the voice without is comparatively still. We are well aware of the prophetic declamations of men of influence in certain quarters; and are not by any means disposed to disregard or trifle with their words,—they tell us, that “the public mind is every day becoming more and more busied with the bearings of the subject,—that already (1837) a committee on English education has terminated its evidence,—another, on Irish, is about to report;—two others on the Irish education board are occupied at this moment in the House; Lord Brougham has his bill; an address to the crown is to be moved; statistical societies are formed, &c.\* And, again, besides these matters, the “principle of the compulsory system is acknowledged in the case of the factory children, and the principle of government interference without regard to religious party in the educational grants of 20,000*l.* a year, &c.”† But we have carefully considered what this specious boasting is worth. And we are sure that there are antagonist statements to be advanced, which possess the solid character of *facts*, and are quite equal to stand their ground against any such assertions as these. In the first place—This whole matter of the education committees, which seem to be arranged like an army against us, (four are enumerated in the foregoing summary,) resolves itself into the Report of *one*, so far as our argument is concerned, viz. the committee for England and Wales; it sat during two sessions, and terminated its business on each occasion in the following words:—“The committee find themselves unable to report any opinion to the House;—they will therefore content themselves with referring the House

\* Thos. Wyse, Esq. M. P. in Second Art. of first Publication of the Central Education Society, p. 63.

† B. Hawes, Esq. M. P. in Tenth Art. of the first Publication of the Central Education Society, p. 281.

to the Evidence, and expressing a hope that the House will, early in the next session, direct a further prosecution of inquiry upon a subject which they deem of the highest national importance." But there was no vigour in the proceedings during the second year, and the suggestion for the re-appointment of the committee was not attended to when Parliament met again; nor do we hear that there is any disposition to revive its meetings now, but the contrary. A committee, after the lapse of one whole session, has been appointed, not generally for England, but for large towns. As to the bill of Lord Brougham, whether in the session we have just referred to, or in that of the present year, our inferences from the politeness and flattery with which it was received are not very favourable to the success of his lordship's hopes. It is obvious that there can be nothing more convenient for the government than to have such a measure in suspense before the House. It is no trifling accommodation in the discharge of public business to have his lordship's mind so innocently engaged as in reveries of the mighty changes he is about to effect. Considering the relative position and the difference of feeling which exists between the two Houses of Parliament, it is better, without question, that their lordships should discuss the matter among themselves, than that another bill should come up from the lower House only to die *the* natural death. And it must be wonderously agreeable for ministers to be able at any moment to overthrow the whole scheme which is before the House, and to leave the blame of failure not on the ministry, but on one whose back is now inured to the bearing of such a burden. Lord Lansdowne's speech on 1st December, betrayed indications of considerable self-complacency at the position in which he and his colleagues thus stood; nor did the noble advocate of the measure himself appear altogether unaware of the position in which he himself was placed. He said, and it excited a smile, that, with regard to the former bill, which was the same in principle with that he now brought in, notwithstanding the labour he had taken in forming an abstract and digest, to enable the House to comprehend the subject with the least possible trouble,

"Yet it was not attended to at the beginning of the session, because it was then too early, and it was not attended to at the end of the session, because it was then too late. I cannot say (he added) that your lordships were prevented applying yourselves to the subject at the beginning of the session on account of the press of business, for there was none; and for some time afterwards your lordships did just as much. At the end of the session there came an event, &c. . . . and no further public business could be transacted."\*

As to the principle of compulsory education just referred to as

\* The Mirror of Parliament.



the sign of an approaching consummation in these matters, we submit that the case of the factory children is not in point. The drift and design of the act, and the principle it contains, is simply this, that children shall not be overworked; and in proof that such provision is effectually secured, it is enacted that besides the limitation as to hours of employment at the factory, they are to produce a certificate of hours usefully employed elsewhere. That mind must, indeed, be very strangely infatuated, which can pervert such a sober and temperate arrangement to secure the health of children, and prevent the abuse of young apprentices, (many of whom are at a distance from their friends,) into a formal admission by the great council of the nation, of the propriety of a compulsory national education of the young. And how can the annual grant of 20,000*l.* a year be regarded as any proof that government is disposed to incur the requisite expense for a national education carried on by the state? We have, for the five years it has been voted, deduced an inference of the very opposite kind. It has seemed to us like an indirect voucher that help might be looked for to *limited extent*, but that no notion was seriously entertained of adding any item of moment to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's account. And we inferred that government were not disposed (whatever theory, or whatever convictions, they might otherwise entertain,) to disturb the operations of existing societies for education and the voluntary principle which has so long been at work.

In 1834 Dr. N. H. Julius, the conductor of an educational journal and statistical work under the sanction of the ministry in Prussia, was examined before the education committee on England and Wales. We have reason to know that while his general statements stimulated the desires of all members who were looking for the blessings of national centralization and continental schemes, his plain business-like financial exposition, threw a dark and thick cloud over their views. There was no one point on which the opinions of the committee were more completely settled by the evidence they obtained than this, viz. that considerations of expense forbade the entertainment of the grand and comprehensive schemes which should give the whole management of scholastic affairs and interests into the hands of government. But it was not for them to report on such a matter, and thus quash all the pleasing speculations and theories of the day. Dr. Julius explained that the schoolmasters throughout Prussia were generally provided with a house and garden, (which in England is not the case, where such provision consequently would have to be made,) and that the salary of those in country places was little more than 10*l.* a year;—some received only that sum;—the salaries of others varied up to 30*l.* as a maximum;—and that in the

larger towns and in Berlin the maximum salary might be 60*l.* a year. (In England, however, the present scale of salaries is about double of these amounts.) Under such circumstances in Prussia, he said, "the general current annual expense of the whole education (including the universities) amounted to 300,000*l.* and made more than a twenty-fifth part of the whole expenditure of the monarchy."

Mr. Simpson, in his evidence, p. 140, said, "it would require at least as large a grant as the great grant to the West India proprietors to establish a system of national education all over the empire, and perhaps greater;" "yes, (he repeated,) *twenty millions*; as much has often been granted for the fitting out of a fleet, &c." But he was aware that the legislature and the country would be frightened at such a sum, he feared it must be obtained gradually and by successive votes; and, p. 163, the salaries of the board of education, he thought, should be as high as those of the judges, they (the education board) would be quite as important functionaries, and ought to be made so by the government.

Such is the expense which the advocates of a new plan of education honestly avow they shall require to be incurred. And, the various assertions made in the first publication of the Central Society of Education, are fully in accordance with such a scale. Nor are we prepared to say that the calculations are very far wide of the truth, or would exceed the necessities of the case which is supposed. But we do not scruple to hazard a somewhat decided opinion that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has no notion of incurring such responsibilities, nor does any one of the ministry seriously entertain an idea of the kind. On the contrary, the meagre allowance which has been doled out in so noble a cause, and the half offer of assistance in promoting normal schools, which has first been made and then silently withdrawn,\* convince us that the government views are altogether of a different kind. Nor do the leading advocates of the measure seriously think that the legislature are in earnest on the subject.

"True it is, they tell us, that some years must elapse before a bill for national education, such as the people of this country *ought to demand*, will pass the House of Lords (where the bill of this session is now happily and safely lodged!) but a bill for education is not at the present moment a *sine quâ non*. Ministers have the power in their own hands, assisted by a simple vote of the House of Commons, of extending indefinitely the number of schools, and of commencing a reform in those which already exist."†

\* We allude to an annual grant of 10,000*l.* voted for *Schools in Scotland and model schools in England* at first, but now voted for *schools in Scotland* only.

† Central Society's Publications.

Admitting, as we do, with certain qualifications, the truth of the last paragraph, it is because the ministry possess this power, and have had it all along, and because they avail themselves of it to so very small an extent, that we confidently infer that there is no more intention on their part to carry *the great* educational measure, than there is desire on the part of the country at large that a bill for such a purpose should be passed.

Let those, however, who are in high places, and on whose *fiat* we are supposing the question to turn, let them be permitted only to speak for themselves. While we hear them, be it remembered that *the grand* educational scheme involves, according to some of its warmest advocates, the compulsory attendance of children in schools, as in Prussia; according to others, the entire separation of religious instruction from the every-day business of schools; and according to all, the transferring into the hands of government, or a central board, of which the government must form a part, the whole supervision and control of school affairs.

The debate which recently took place in the House of Lords began with a speech from the Bishop of London on the presentation of a petition against a compulsory education of the people, and the exclusively secular character which the petitioners had heard that some persons were desirous to have enforced with the sanction of the law. His lordship said,

“A feeling appears to have gone forth through the country, that it is the intention of her majesty’s government to introduce some measure of this kind. I do not believe this to be the case: I do not think it at all probable, after the course pursued by ministers for some years past. They have adopted the wiser plan of granting a sum of money for the furtherance of education generally, and leaving its application to those societies who are able to meet it with funds of their own: both of which proceed on the principle, that religious instruction should form the basis of all education. This is a much wiser course than it would be to attempt to interfere in a compulsory manner, and to enforce a system which I am well convinced the people of this country would never obey.”

This was a challenge calculated to ascertain the mind of ministers, and of any who were interested particularly in the subject. It was immediately met by Lord Brougham in the most unqualified terms. And his lordship’s assertions were confirmed by Lord Lansdowne a few nights afterwards.

“Lord Brougham.—I do not believe that either on the part of her majesty’s government—on the part of any set of men,—be they in office or out of office—be they corporate or unincorporated,—or, on the part of any individual who has education at heart, and being impressed with a sense of its paramount importance, is also acquainted with the people of this country,—there can exist any intention of promoting legislative measures, either for the purpose of making the education of

the people compulsory on the people, (God forbid! unless it be intended to make education hateful to them,) or upholding a system of national education which shall exclude religious instruction altogether. I have not heard of any such design in any quarter."—*Mirror of Parliament*, part 441, p. 139.

"Lord Lansdowne.—It is unnecessary for me to say, after the conversation which took place in this house a few evenings ago, that no intention exists, on the part of the government, to force the adoption of a compulsory system of education on the country, or to favour any system from which religious instruction is excluded. Not only is that the fact, not only can I aver that such a project has never entered into the contemplation of government, but I believe I may confidently say, that it never was thought of by any body of men whatsoever."—*Ibid.* part 442, p. 274.

The evening before the Lord President of the council made this declaration, the Secretary of State for the Home Department, upon Mr. Slaney's motion for a select committee to consider the best means of providing useful education for the children of the poorer classes in large towns throughout England and Wales, said,

"I am quite certain that if any plan were adopted in which the religious feelings of this country were not consulted, it would be a decided failure, and an obstacle to the introduction of any plan hereafter. . . . When I give my assent to the motion of my honourable friend, I am impressed with the belief that it will be proper for parliament to take decisive measures for the promotion of education, but that it is a question which no government ought to take up without due consideration, because if they were to introduce any plan which might excite either resentment or repugnance in the people of this country on account of their religious feelings, or that would create additional motives for dissension between the Established Church and the great body of the Dissenters; they would not be furthering, they would be only obstructing, the great cause which we all have at heart. Therefore when I express an anxious hope that some such plan will be adopted, I wish particularly to guard myself against any pledge to any specific plan."—*Mirr. Parl.*, part 442, p. 254.

If such is the language of men who have matured a comprehensive scheme of their own to bring forward, or who have any specific plans at all in view different from those which are now in operation, we are utterly at a loss to comprehend how their integrity and honesty can remain unaffected. Or, rather, if such language is not a distinct pledge that no new principle of important interference with educational affairs is contemplated, we know not what a public declaration is worth.

The conclusion, therefore, to which we are drawn by the preceding observations and extracts, is just this, that the minds of our senators and of the public at large are still open and ready to hear arguments in favour of *preserving and improving* the existing

state of scholastic affairs. We propose to set forth some such reasons in further confirmation of this conclusion, as are grounded upon facts, and may, we think, tend to open and clear the eyes of certain persons to the real bearings of the question of education, considering the position in which the country now stands. We speak of the opening and clearing of the eyes of the understanding, because we are satisfied that many have been blinded by the dust which has been raised of late about this affair, (whether designedly or intentionally, we will not say). It is however to be avowed freely, and the assertion shall be substantiated by a selection from passages now before us (numbers of which must be omitted from want of space), that some of the popular productions of the day are full of partial statements, and omissions of matter which properly forms a part and parcel of what is adduced, for the purpose of influencing the judgment of readers; which things are by no means creditable to the authors' feelings and taste.

On the whole, it has been thought that in the present state of things, and considering the difficulty which there is in getting access, or in finding time to examine reports, statistical tables, parliamentary documents, &c. &c., we should serve the cause best if we were to put forth, in the first place, a kind of *catalogue raisonné* on the subject of education; and afterwards submit the conclusions which appear naturally to follow from them. Materials exist in abundance for such a task. The history of schools in this country may be traced from its early rise to the fulness (comparatively) of stature which it has now attained. There are documents tolerably succinct, besides those which stand at the head of this article, which enable us to show what is actually doing by different parties throughout the country; what various plans it has been supposed we might adopt with good effect; what would satisfy the feelings of benevolent persons who have hitherto freely devoted their wealth, and time, and strength in promoting schools, and stir up a godly jealousy among them that they should press on even more zealously and effectually than before, in their service of love;—and what, from the avowed practices and principles of such people, must tend to thwart and embarrass and disgust them, and introduce confusion and enmity, where now indeed there is rivalry and competition, but where there is no open breach of harmony and peace.

A document put forth by the National Society in 1832, and circulated by that body as a *single sheet*, will help us a good way in the first part of the task we here propose. It is entitled, "*History of the Rise and Progress of Schools for the Religious Education of the Poor*," and appeared in the Society's 21st Report, for 1832.

Schools are traced from the Reformation of the National

Church to the present time, and some facts are gleaned from documents of an earlier date. The following abstract contains some of the principal heads :—

“ From ‘ The Survey of London ’ by Mr. Stow, it appears that three principal schools belonged to three principal churches in the metropolis in A. D. 1140 ; that there were poor scholars (*pauperes scholares*) connected with every cathedral church, and some other helps. The foundations of Winchester, A. D. 1382 ; Eton, A. D. 1446 ; and St. Paul’s School, A. D. 1508 ; of Christ Church, Newgate, in 1553 ; of Westminster, in 1559 ; Merchant Tailor’s School, 1561 ; and other similar foundations are detailed. It seems that there was a bill in 1539, for ‘ converting religious houses to a better use,’ and a plan on the part of Archbishop Cranmer for ‘ grammar schools in every shire.’ The strictly ecclesiastical arrangements are detailed and shown to have afforded a considerable help in enlightening the people. Some singular schemes of a Mr. Nedham, in 1663, are referred to as expressly designed for the poorest class, which is proved among other things by the quaintness of his appeal to the humane :—‘ Take notice of the rabble we meet in the streets, it must needs pity any Christian heart to see the little dirty infantry which swarms up and down the alleys and lanes, &c.’ The plans (and schools now existing and flourishing) which Archbishops Tillotson and Tenison formed ; ‘ the constellation of noble designs which brightened the prospects of the religious world’ at the beginning of the last century ; the rise of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and for Propagating the Gospel ; and the public annual assembling of charity schools in the metropolis, are related, with the extraordinary efforts of that age ; the collections by the clergy after week-day lectures ; the plan of paying for education in part ; an improved organization of parish clerks ; the help of offertory money ; the produce of charity boxes in the Church ; the *voluntary* collecting of taxes in certain places that the poundage might go to the cause of schools ; the farming of street lamps, and maintaining of and boarding parish children in other places with the same design, furnish interesting proofs of the spirit of the age. Then, there are three plans specially enumerated, which had each its day. 1. The Wiltshire Village School System ; 2. The plan of the Welsh Circulating Schools ; and 3. The ‘ Petty School’ plan in the Isle of Man, which were “ the foundation of catechising.” After this follows the rise of Sunday-schools, and the gradual ripening and whitening towards the harvest which after-ages were to bring in. In 1796 the well known efforts of ‘ The Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor’ are related ; and lastly, the source of whatever has followed, the discovery at Madras by Dr. Bell, and the skilful application and development of the system of mutual tuition by that person and Mr. Lancaster,” &c., &c.

In all this history, which is exceedingly interesting, and within the power of any person to procure by asking at the National Society’s Central School, the most remarkable fact, to our apprehension, is this, viz. that the whole is the result of the benevolent and voluntary exertions of individuals. We believe it to be per-

fectly true that, "in the English Statute Book from Queen Elizabeth to the present day no notice occurs of schools and schoolmasters, nor any reference to education in England, except by *restrictions* on schoolmasters: imposing disabilities and incapacities, instead of providing support and encouragement."\*

It might be worth while to stop and inquire here, who they are, and by what principles and spirit they are influenced, who would erect their machinery to stop the stream which has thus flowed for ages widening and deepening its bed as it went on, and adapting itself to the increasing wants of the nation at large; a flood which has made and forced out a passage for itself, and adapted its course to the necessities and inequalities of the soil through which it has flowed? It might be worth while to ask those who talk of our present broken cisterns as decayed, and as incapable of holding any water at all, what mighty supplies they have to open, which shall fertilize and gladden the face of the soil with a rapidity or an efficacy exceeding or even equalling that which has marked the history of ages gone by?

But the answer to such inquiries will become more apparent as we bring forward other facts, in connexion with the subject, which press on our attention, and fill up the chasm which occurs at the point where the history (to which we have briefly referred) concludes.

The compilers of the Education Abstract made upon the Returns ordered by Parliament in 1833, saw the value of this history and printed it as an appendix to their Report. They coupled with it also some

"Remarks on the Four Chief Educational Societies in the Metropolis, extracted from their Annual Reports for 1834, and from the Evidence given by the Officers of those Societies before a Committee of the House of Commons in the same year, with a view of explaining the cause and showing the extent of *Duplicate Entries* in the school returns."

This is a valuable summary for the purpose of showing what has been and what is doing in the country for the education of the people. Taken in connexion with the reports, &c. which stand at the head of our article, it would furnish a complete account on the subject. Its importance induces us to offer an abstract of the following kind:

"I. Among the societies, the first, in regard to the date of its origin, is 'The Society for the support and encouragement of Sunday-schools throughout the British dominions,' established in London in 1785. It arose out of the exertions of Mr. R. Raikes of Gloucester, and the Rev. T. Stock, in 1783.

"The committee, 18 in number, consists in equal parts of members of the Church of England and Protestant Dissenters. The assistance

\* Poor Reports, vol. iv. Introduction, p. 36.

which it renders to schools is by grants of books ; and all schools which receive its aid are bound to attend some place of worship every Sunday, where practicable, and not to teach writing on the Sabbath-day.

“ II. The society instituted next after this, viz. in 1803, is ‘The Sunday-school Union.’ Its objects are, 1. To encourage Sunday-school teachers to greater exertions ; 2. To improve the methods of tuition ; 3. To enlarge existing and establish new schools ; 4. To supply books, &c. Its scholars are generally connected with some congregation, and attend on the Lord’s Day at its place of worship.

“ The committee consists of 36 members, with all clergymen and dissenting ministers who contribute to the funds. Since June, 1824, they have recommended the country Unions to admit into connexion with them such schools only whose conductors are of orderly character, and who hold the doctrines of the Deity and Atonement of Jesus Christ, the divine influences of the Holy Spirit, and that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God.

“ It is stated that the Sunday-schools of the Union have been doubled in their amount within the last fifteen years.

“ III. The next institution is ‘The British and Foreign School Society,’ formed in 1808. It arose out of the exertions made by Mr. Lancaster, and is designed to promote the education of the working classes of every denomination. Books or papers are published for the use of the schools. The Society upholds the principle of liberty of conscience, and the utter abolition of religious tests in connexion with common day school education. The Society has no connexion with Sunday-schools ; no catechism or creed is introduced, nor is any form of prayer taught or used in the schools. It maintains a model school in the Borough-road, and trains all persons who desire to be qualified as teachers of youth. Schools supplied with teachers at its expense are required to be open to the children of parents of all denominations. Grants of school materials, and small donations, are sometimes voted by the Society to schools. The teachers seldom continue in training at the model school for so much as three months.

“ A committee of 48 subscribers conducts the affairs.

“ The schools of this Society are not brought into union by means of any form or terms ; and (except in the metropolis) no returns have been obtained of the number of children receiving education in them.

“ IV. The fourth Society is ‘The National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales.’ It was formed in 1811, and adopted the discovery made by the Rev. Dr. Bell, at Madras, in 1797. The committee, comprising the Bishops, are appointed by charter, and 16 other members are elected. The Society maintains a central school in the Sanctuary, Westminster, and provides for the instruction of masters and mistresses, who continue under its care upon an average for five months each. The Society promotes 1. Schools for infants under six or seven years of age ; 2. Sunday and Daily Schools for children from six or seven to about thirteen ; and 3. Sunday-schools, chiefly for those who are engaged in labour during the week, the evening being the only time, except on the Lord’s Day, when they profit by the school. Schools of the first and last men-



tioned class are frequently combined. The progress of National schools has taken place at the following rate, viz.:—In 1813 there were 230 schools, with 40,484 children; in 1820, 1,614 schools, with about 200,000 scholars; in 1830, 2,609 *places*, containing 3,670 schools, with about 346,000 scholars; and 1835, 3,624 *places*, with 5,559 schools, containing 516,181 scholars.

“The Society has collected and expended above 100,000*l.*, and an additional 20,000*l.* through the medium of its district institutions; and has thus produced an outlay of money, raised by benevolent contributions, to the amount of above 500,000*l.* on school-rooms. Schools enter into union with the Society, or with some of its district branches, and engage to adopt the National system of teaching, to attend on divine service on the Lord’s Day, to use the *religious* tracts of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. There are twenty-four District Societies in England and Wales, which are in connexion with this Institution, and make grants of money, and thirty-four Corresponding Societies, which have not funds for that purpose. Under these (in the principal towns of the kingdom) there are forty-two District Central Schools, for the benefit of persons unable to visit London for their instruction in the art of teaching.”

“The Home and Colonial Infant School Society” had not appeared before the public when the preceding abstract was put forth.

“It was formed in 1836, for improving and extending the infant school system, by 1. Qualifying masters and mistresses of schools with appropriate instruction; 2. Visiting and examining schools where required, and 3. Circulating information, preparing books, school materials, &c. The executive committee consists of eight elected members, who act on the principle that education must be based on the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and that their Central School is open to receive persons of different religious denominations.”

We are induced to add, that the early labours of this institution, which are characterized by energy and zeal, are of the least offensive kind. It has put forth nothing to derogate from the work which other men have performed; its publications are of a sober and temperate character; in proof of which we may mention that the forms and papers it has in use, appear to be framed generally upon the approved documents which are employed for similar purposes by the National Society. As warm friends of the last-named institution (which has a training infant establishment of its own at Westminster, with a boarding-house for the proper accommodation of teachers) we neither admire nor perceive the necessity of the Home and Colonial Society’s exertions. But, if a competitor must necessarily be in the field, if we may not have the infant population left to be framed and fashioned precisely according to our own hearts’ desire, we rejoice to have such a rival to contend with, and to be provoked to holy jealousy by the unblameable zeal which that Society displays. And we confidently point to its origin and its spreading influence as a

proof, beyond confutation, that the energies of the voluntary principle in regard to education are yet unexhausted; that wherever a void or chasm exists in the moral or religious system of our country, or wherever, as in this instance, it is *supposed* to exist, thither the strength and wealth of the benevolent will be brought to bear, deficiencies will be supplied, evils cured or palliated, and the friends of the poor who have begun a good work for their benefit will persevere in the cause, and make good every reasonable expectation which the public can have entertained.

Such, on the whole, is the machinery which the benevolence of the public has created for improving the intellectual, moral and religious condition of the poor. Its worth and efficiency must of course be determined by the fruits which it has borne. Only, we must premise that the golden harvest which some speculators desire to reap at the present hour must not be the measure of our expectations while surveying the efforts of years gone by. If it is now maintained that many great and glorious results would be immediately produced by newly-formed schools, the assertion can only be substantiated on the grounds of what has been done by those schools which already exist. If the fruits of benevolent exertions were swept away from the face of the country, we should never hear at the present hour of schemes which are held forth as perfectly reasonable and attainable by exertions of a moderate kind. A vastly lower standard would be taken as the ultimatum of the reformers' desires. For who would hesitate to admit that the work of education which has already been accomplished in clearing the ground, in levelling and cleansing the soil, was in every respect of greater importance and greater difficulty than that which remains to be accomplished in the way of mere tillage and cropping and gathering in of fruit? But we are disposed throughout this whole matter to rest our argument on facts, and we gladly recur to authentic documents, instead of propping up our cause with many words.

There are two modes of computation by which the results of the machinery just described must be estimated. We must look for a numerical, and we also look for a moral result from these exertions and expenditure of benevolent funds. Of the former it is comparatively easy to give account;—the latter involves considerations of a more complicated description. We shall, however, address ourselves in succession to each.

Of the five societies for education, one only professes at present to give any numerical results. The first and third never did give any, except by showing, from year to year, what schools actually received assistance out of the funds of the institution, and the summary of *metropolitan* schools which is contained in every Report of the British and Foreign School Society. The

Sunday-School Union did give every year, except the last, a rather vague report of voluntary teachers and scholars instructed by them. But there was obvious exaggeration in the statement, which it is needless to dwell upon, because it has been recently suppressed by the publishers themselves, and instead thereof, they have substituted the Abstract of Education Returns, obtained by order of Parliament in 1833. Upon this last document, and the Returns of the National Society, our calculation must be based, and we are spared much space and trouble in the operation by the 10th appendix of that Society's Report for 1837. The public will there find, in considerable detail, an account of the inquiries made by the Society in 1826, 1831, and 1833;—with an abstract of similar results obtained by order of Parliament in 1818 and 1833;—they will find, also, copies of the questions circulated on each occasion, with the principal remarks which those who conducted the calculations, and examined the returns, thought it necessary to put on record by way of explanation. We will compare the Society's inquiries in 1831 and 1837 with each other; and the parliamentary inquiries in 1818 and 1833 with each other, and state our conclusions derived from this process, and from a comparative view of the deductions made by each party.

The SUMMARY of the National Society's inquiries stands thus : early in 1837 there were 12,391 places in England and Wales, containing 16,924 schools, with 996,460 scholars ; the INCREASE since 1831, during *six* years, being 3,610 schools, and 96,048 scholars.

The result here given comprises a calculation for defective returns. The schools are *Sunday* (with or without any evening or other instruction); *Sunday and daily* (meaning instruction on five days of the week), and infant schools (being only week-day schools). They are all professedly religious institutions for the benefit of the poorer classes, more or less under the direction of the clergy, and, excepting the infant schools, generally attending public worship at the parish churches. The detailed account distinguishes the schools (16,924) and the scholars (96,048) thus: Sunday-schools 6,068, with scholars 438,280;—Sunday and daily schools 10,152, with scholars 514,450;—Infant schools 704, with scholars 49,392, from which last number 5,662 are deducted, the same children being also comprised in the Sunday-school returns. The Summary does not comprise the new union workhouse-schools, nor the schools which are in the course of being established by aid of the parliamentary grants. All dames' schools are also excluded, and all private scholars who make high payments for their education, are deducted from the total of the schools to which they belong.

The SUMMARY of the parliamentary inquiry in 1833 is as follows: Sunday-schools 16,828, with scholars 1,548,890;—daily schools 35,986, with scholars 1,187,942;—and infant schools 2985, with scholars 89,005;—the INCREASE of schools, since 1818, during *fifteen* years, being Sunday-schools 11,285, with scholars 1,123,397, and infant and daily schools 19,645, with scholars 671,243.

In this Summary, infant and daily schools are not accurately discriminated. Colleges, except the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, grammar, boarding, proprietary schools, and all preparatory institutions, are comprised in the daily schools; and dames' schools of every description are given as infant schools. Hence 2350 infant schools, which are supported entirely by payments from the scholars, contain only, on an average, seventeen children in each; and 26,791 daily schools, which are similarly supported, contain only twenty-five children in each. There are no means of showing how many of the daily scholars are comprised in the Sunday-schools, and occasion a duplicate entry of the same children, or, by calculation, what the total number of children receiving education may be. And it is to be observed, with regard to the *increase* of schools, that the questions in 1818 and 1833, and the objects with which they were proposed, were so widely different, that considerable doubt is thrown over the result under this head, which appears to be attained with accuracy.

What then, after all, is the number of children of the working classes who are under instruction? It is a question which, we submit, cannot be fully answered at present. The Church can answer it, as we have shown, distinctly as regards itself. But, there are many under instruction besides those in Church schools. The only approximation we could make towards the desired conclusion must be by taking the gross number of scholars, Sunday, daily, and infant, returned in 1833, (*viz.* 2,825,837,) and deducting from that amount the Church of England Sunday and daily scholars, who have doubtless occasioned a duplicate entry to be made. But then, the remainder (thus obtained) would comprise a vast number of petty dames' schools, which are quite undeserving of the name of schools, and a vast number of private academies, with King's College, and University College, &c. which it never could have been intended to comprise in the result.

But if we cannot make an exact approximation to the number who are receiving education; can we determine the number who ought properly to be upon the school-rolls, and enlisted under the head of infant, daily, or Sunday scholars, *i. e.*, can we ascertain the number of children, belonging to the working classes, who ought to profit by public instruction offered at a cheap rate,

and who would do so, we assume, if the schools were such as satisfied the parents, and produced a visible and beneficial result? We may not be able to attain to the exact solution of this inquiry, but by a comparison of the different population returns, an approximation may be made to it, and a result obtained of value and interest. Such a result we have not seen deduced, or attempted to be deduced, before.

Our calculations on the subject run thus :—

The population of England and Wales, in 1831, was 13,897,187;—at the present time, allowing the rate of increase to be (what it is ascertained to be)  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum, the population is now 15,195,782. In the returns for 1831, the ages of the people are not classified as they are in those for 1821. By these latter returns it appeared that there were,

- |     |           |                |                     |              |
|-----|-----------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|
| (A) | 1,566,268 | children under | 5                   | years of age |
| (B) | 1,376,315 | . . . . .      | between 5 . . . . . | and 10       |
| (C) | 1,172,979 | . . . . .      | 10 . . . . .        | 15           |
| (D) | 1,045,155 | . . . . .      | 15 . . . . .        | 20           |

If the population be supposed as at present, of 15,195,782, these last four amounts will respectively be (A) 2,279,120,—(B) 1,904,572,—(C) 1,701,185, and (D) 1,508,161.

Now, on the supposition that the children are equally diffused over the several years which are comprised within each period of five, if we add three-fifths of the first amount (A) to two-fifths of the second amount (B), we shall obtain 2,165,300, or about one-seventh of the population, as the number of children between two years and seven years who are qualified by age to attend infant schools. So, if we add three-fifths of the second amount (B) to two-fifths of the third amount (C), we shall obtain 1,877,218, or about one-eighth of the population, as the number of children between seven and twelve years of age who are similarly qualified for Sunday and daily schools;—and, by adding three-fifths of the third amount (C) to one-fifth of the fourth amount (D), we obtain 1,322,343, or about one-eleventh, as the number of young persons between twelve and sixteen whose age might cause them to be employed in useful services, but might still render it proper that they should attend Sunday-schools, and gain some instruction on other days or in the evening through the week. Hence the total number of children between two and sixteen years of age appears to be 5,364,861, or somewhat more than one-third of the whole population. But many of these children are not of a class or station in society to profit by public means of cheap education. Can any approximation be made to show how many are thus circumstanced?—and how many ought to attend schools?

The population returns for 1831 show that there are 834,543 *families* in the kingdom chiefly employed in agriculture;—1,227,614 *families* chiefly employed in trade, manufactures, and handicraft; and 849,717 *families* of capitalists, professional and other educated men, *and labourers NOT employed in agriculture*. If we multiply each of these amounts by five, the product will show about (rather more than) the number of persons (men, women, and children) *maintained* under the three divisions which have been recited;—the products will be respectively 4,562,625, —6,712,345; and 4,645,585. The sum of these three products is, of course, somewhat (730,773) more than the total population, 15,195,783. If, therefore, as a rough approximation, we reduce each of these three products to the same extent, (*viz.* by one-third of the excess, 730,773,) we shall have this result:—

(E) Persons <i>maintained</i> by agriculture . . .	4,321,034
(F) Persons chiefly maintained by trade, manufactures, and handicraft . . . . .	6,470,754
(G) Persons maintained as capitalists, from professional resources, &c., or by <i>labour not agricultural</i> . . . . .	4,403,994
<hr/>	
Total of population, in 1838, in England & Wales	15,195,782
<hr/>	

Almost all\* the first class (E) require the assistance of cheap public schools;—but the superior mechanics and handicraftsmen in the second class (F) do *not* require it;—on the other hand, in the third class (G), the labourers not agricultural (they are chiefly persons employed in mines, fisheries, railways, canals, and public works,) do require it. Supposing, then, that there is a compensation of errors between the class F and the class G (as many not requiring the means of education referred to in F as do require them in G), we may take the sum of the first and second classes, E and F, 10,791,788, to represent the population for whom cheap public means of education are required. And, according to the proportions already ascertained—

$\frac{1}{7}$ of this population is the amount between 2 & 7 years of age . . . . .	=	1,541,684
$\frac{1}{8}$ ————— between 7 & 12	=	1,348,973
$\frac{1}{11}$ ————— between 12 & 16	=	98,171
		<hr/>

Total number of children between 2 & 16 requiring the means of cheap public education . . . }	3,871,758
<hr/>	

\* Persons who *employ* labourers are included in this class.

If this result may be at all relied on, (we are not aware in what point it fails, and it is in every one's power to verify its truth,) it is obvious that there is still a lamentable want of schools throughout the country. However, in estimating the extent of this want, the fluctuation of the children in schools must be constantly borne in mind. And we apprehend, that if due attention be paid to this and some similar circumstances, the results obtained will prove that the parents do not appreciate the means of proper education for their children; and, consequently, in the present state of the adult population, we may actually have as many schools as are required: or, to state the case more properly, we must raise the character of the parents, or else have recourse to some compulsory measures (which it is not our object to advocate), in order to secure a better use of the schools which exist. But the reflections connected with this point would lead us astray from the course we proposed to follow.\*

Having disposed, though not quite satisfactorily, of the numerical bearings of the question respecting schools that exist, and the extent to which the wishes of benevolent persons have been carried out, we proceed to an estimate of a different kind. What is the moral, intellectual, and religious result produced by those

\* It is startling to read that there are nearly four million children between 2 and 16 years of age requiring cheap instruction, while there are little more than one million of them in Church schools, and in all other schools together (comprising Church schools), less than two million and a half. To account for such a state of things, it must be remembered that, 1st, the general returns in 1833 were far from complete (see *British Critic*, July 1835, pp. 179, 180); and, 2dly, that the fluctuation of pupils in all the schools is immense.

In treating of the comparative value of endowed and unendowed schools (same *Article*, pp. 204, 205), we gave some striking proofs of this fluctuation of scholars, from statements made before parliamentary committees. On looking to the Report of the National Society for 1832, p. 96, we see that 30 metropolitan schools, taken at hazard from out of the general returns, contained 10,767, and the admissions into the schools during each of the two preceding years had been 7,373, exclusive of re-admissions of children who had been in and out of the schools before; and, in 1834, Report, page 58, 30 schools were taken, which contained 9,715 children, the admissions into which, during the year, were 5,276. The Central Society, in a note to its First Publication, states, p. 172, that "although the British and Foreign Model School contains 600 children, there were no less than 697 fresh admittances in the course of 1836." This shows, that in that institution the case is far worse than in the national schools, and that in none of the schools do the children on an average remain for two years. In the inferior, dame, and private schools, the succession is very much greater, and the opportunity of improving the children, supposing the power of doing so to exist, is proportionably less. With such a rapid passing of children through the teachers' hands, it is obvious that the whole four million children *may have been* more or less connected with the schools from time to time, and thus they may all be under education, as their parents vainly imagine. Our inference is this, that churches and preachers are wanted for adults quite as much as rooms and masters for the young. Unless we mean to introduce compulsory laws, the parents must be taught as well as the children; otherwise, in our zeal for education, we shall cover the country with school-rooms and school-masters and mistresses, but the children will not be sent, or, what is as bad, will not remain at school.

which exist? How do the schools work? Perhaps there are, altogether, about a million and a half, or rather more, of the children of the working classes under education in *schools of a public nature, where instruction is afforded at a very cheap rate, where rules and discipline are enforced, and where some superior mind presides*, or, at least, generally directs the operations of the schoolmaster or mistress; what fruits are to be seen of the exertions and care of this kind? There are two opinions to be stated, one of which, especially, has of late years been pretty loudly and plainly expressed. But, notwithstanding, the advocates for the voluntary principle, and of the benevolent exertions which have been made, are not dissatisfied with the produce of their labours, and they are ready to carry them on with cheerfulness, and at a considerable expenditure of their private resources.

But the public, who have not hitherto been actively concerned in the work, are divided into two opposite classes, both of which unite, indeed, in the praises of the religious portion of society for what has been done and what there is still a disposition to do;—of these two classes, however, one proclaims its entire dissatisfaction at the result, considered abstractedly, and calls for a complete and fundamental change in the schools; the other, does not see the extraordinary defects and faults which are referred to, although it would gladly improve the institutions and profit by every facility for doing so.

We fearlessly quote the opinions of the former class, being satisfied, that if they are true, they cannot be too widely known, and if they are false, or exaggerated, they need only be submitted to the light, in order that their real character may be exposed. The following are specimens of what we refer to:—

“The age of adolescence, in all instances, is the most dangerous in life: it requires a peculiar treatment, and deserves an attention, which in this country *has never yet been bestowed* upon it.\*

“Nor is their religious training much better managed than in elementary schools. The ‘alphabet learning’ of the sacred writ, the superstitious preference of letter to spirit, continues to prevail.†

“England forms the one great exception to the entire civilized world (in the total want of a national organization). The result is not of such a nature as to make us much in love with the cause. It could easily be shown, that the voluntary system of public instruction, with no central power to guide, aid, and control, has not only not worked well, but worked nearly as ill as any system well could. Every sort of antic has been played; all sorts of empirism been permitted; immense waste of time, money, and labour,—often, too, with the most admirable zeal and the best intentions,—with the most miserable, if not injurious, results.‡

\* Central Society of Education, First Publication, p. 11.

† Ibid. p. 61.

‡ Ibid. p. 62.



"The schools, where there are any to which they (the working population) can send their children, are for the most part of a character which not only forbids hope of good, but even creates apprehension of evil.\* The amount of education is not only lamentably deficient, but, in its kind, not comprising those essentials which are most necessary."†

And in the Second Publication by the same Society from which these words are quoted, we read what follows:—

"Some of these schools are positive nuisances, which, if they cannot be reformed, ought to be put down.‡

"We may now form a tolerably correct opinion of what is doing and what remains to be done for the education of the people. . . . The truth is, England will soon be, if it be not already, the worst educated country in Europe. Even in countries deemed uncivilized, more is done for the education of the poorer classes than in our own. . . . Nothing but inordinate vanity and self-love have blinded us to the truth, that a large proportion of our population are, morally and physically, in a far inferior state to that of the American Indian, whom we term savage."§

We copy the following from a contemporary magazine, the professed guardian of education.||

"We are by no means certain that education has not rather retrograded than advanced, during the intermediate period. There does not exist a school where the principles and practice of true education are developed; there does not exist a book in which lessons are to be found and exercises enjoined, calculated to develop the physical, intellectual, and moral, powers. There does not exist a system that bears a remote approach to what England, the first country in the world, ought to demand for her sons.

"The masters of our National, British and Foreign, and Infant Schools, are, with but few exceptions, composed of handicraftsmen out of employment, gentlemen's servants, or broken-down petty tradesmen; who often come to the central establishments, and what they call by courtesy Normal Schools, ignorant, in many instances, of the common rules of arithmetic, and so miserably instructed in other matters, and at an age so advanced, as to leave little hope of their ever being improved in character, capability, or fitness, for the important work.' "

And the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society does not scruple to state, not only

"That the existing provision for popular instruction is deficient in quantity, and, in too many cases, still more defective in quality" . . . . but . . . . "shut out from every thing that can sustain or ennoble an

\* Central Society of Education, First Publication, p. 210.

† Ibid. p. 215.

‡ Schools for the Industrious Classes, p. 34.

§ pp. 63, 64.

|| Educational Magazine, No. I. pp. 1, 2.

intelligent nature, the peasantry of England have long since displayed, in unparalleled degradation, the full effects of knowledge denied, and have now sunk into a state of mental inanition and semi-barbarism, from which, it is to be feared, the present generation can never be recovered.\*

Nothing can be less equivocal than condemnation such as this. Is it true, or is it false,—or, is it an exaggerated statement only?—Is it put forth out of pure zeal for the improvement of the people, or is it in any way designed for purposes which are not openly avowed?—Indeed, there is very little secrecy observed.—The context, in too many instances, proves that the remarks are especially directed against the Church of England schools. We shall show, by and bye, that the principal among them, those from the publications of the Central Society of Education, have this especial aim. And, if there were none to lift up their voices on the other side, if there were no counter-statements to produce, we might indeed look with confidence for an early annihilation of all our existing schools, and the introducing of others in their places on quite a different plan. But, happily, there are facts and evidences to be adduced in direct opposition to the miserable portraiture which has been exhibited of our schools. There have been abundant testimonies borne to the efficacy and usefulness of the present means of education, both by the clergy in general, and the National Society in particular. There is an Appendix † in the Reports of this last-named institution, which, year after year, has contained a series of facts of the most gratifying kind from the District and Corresponding Societies, scattered, as they are, over every part of the kingdom;—there is another appendix, ‡ on keeping up connexion with old pupils, formerly brought up in the schools, which is full of authentic statements, bearing expressly on the matter at issue;—and, still more opposite is the result of an inquiry, given in much detail, into the character and condition of young persons brought up in national schools. And

“ We believe we may (like a writer of the present day) with perfect truth assert that the National Society is labouring at both points; labouring to increase the number of schools throughout the land: labouring also to enlarge the instruction given therein, that, without losing one jot of its Christian character, it may include many departments of popular knowledge.”—*Melville's Sermon on Religious Education*, p. 35. 1838.

If the other voluntary associations have anything of the same

\* National Education, the Question of Questions, by Henry Dunn, pp. 5, 6.

† Report of the National Society for 1837, App. vii., and in every preceding Report.

‡ Ibid. for 1831, App. ix. reprinted with enlargement, 1837, App. ix.

kind to adduce, and we doubt not that many of them have, we are thoroughly satisfied with the present result of past exertions; though we should heartily desire to see a continued course of improvement, and doubt not, that the exertions which have produced so much already, will succeed hereafter in a far more gratifying degree.

But it is not merely that these societies speak well of themselves; there are disinterested witnesses who have spoken out on their behalf, in a manner which ought, we think, to have considerable weight. Other societies, no doubt, could point to similar testimony on their own behalf, but we, as being chiefly interested for the national schools of the Church, and because that class of schools is far more extensively spread over the country than any other, are content to recite the following recent testimony in favour of these institutions, which was elicited by the discussion on education in the House of Lords, already referred to at the commencement of this article.

The Bishop of London said:—

.....“ I beg to say, however, that in schools connected with the Established Church, or under the superintendence of the National Society, whatever imperfections may belong to them, there is not one to which the term ‘pretended schools’ may be applied. I know, indeed, that there are schools to which that expression, in its most odious sense, might be appropriated, but they are not in connection with the Established Church. The National Society has made great exertions to improve the schools connected with it, and to extend education; I mean education in the largest sense—not merely scriptural but general education—comprehending instruction in various branches of useful knowledge, and, in some instances, in the elements of science.”—*Mirror of Parliament*, Part 442, p. 276.

Marquess of Lansdowne:—

“ I am surprised that what I said should have been taken to allude to national schools, for to them my remarks bore no reference. I meant to inflict no sort of stigma upon those useful establishments, where the discipline of education is so excellently propounded. I referred to one class of schools, with respect to which the mischievous idea is inculcated, that there is a provision for the education of the children that does not exist. It was to these, and not to national schools, that I alluded.”—*Ibid.* p. 277.

Lord Brougham:—

“ I do not think this is the general state of the schools, very far from it. Many of them afford a very admirable example. I admit that the national schools may justly lay claim to the title of schools, and that the system pursued there may, without flattery, be deemed a system of teaching; but, I will say, that a very large number,—nay, I firmly believe

that the much greater part of the 40,000 charity schools, afford to the youth of England an education which is exceedingly imperfect indeed.” —*Ibid.* p. 282.

Is it thought that these are general expressions of courtesy introduced for the purposes of conciliation in the midst of opposition and debate? The suspicion would be worth considering, if they all came from *one side* of the House! But the interests which the speakers may be supposed to represent are quite different. Or, is it said that the observations refer to discipline and moral culture merely, not to the enlargement of the mind and understanding, and the improvement of the intellect? The passages quoted do not justify the suspicion; on the contrary, they are of a nature to put it entirely at rest. But the National Society's Central School is the model institution which other schools in union propose to imitate, and we gladly profit by the opportunity of showing what is done at that place. The following summary was placed in the hands of a gentleman as an answer to an inquiry he made on this point:—

“ In the Central School religious exercises occupy a considerable portion of the school hours, &c.

“ *Reading*:—The Holy Scriptures; Wells' Geography; Sellon's Abridgement; Le Bas on Scripture Types and Prophecies; Ostervald's Abridgement, and other Tracts, chiefly relating to Scripture History; also, the Elements of Grammar.

“ *Writing*:—Copies; keeping registers of progress; employment of time, &c.; entering sums; accounts, &c.

“ *Ciphering*:—Arithmetic, including vulgar and decimal fractions; the square root; elements of geometry, &c.

“ *Geography*:—Wells, with the maps; maps of St. Paul's travels; the globe,—Europe,—the British isles, &c.

“ History and biography are not professedly taught, but are incidentally introduced in the exercises on geography, and the fulfilment of prophecy respecting nations, &c.

“ *Music*:—Elements of; Psalmody; Turner's Manual. The children, as well as the masters and mistresses in training, learn the notes.

“ The children have the privilege of a lending library, selected from the Catalogue of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge.

“ The masters in training, and the senior boys, have access to a more extensive library; and to facilitate the acquirement of useful knowledge, their attention is directed to such books as may assist them in the study of history, grammar, geography, geometry, &c.; such as, Natural Philosophy, Treatise on Geometry, Martin's Philosophical Grammar, Blunt on the Reformation, History of England, Pursuit of Knowledge, Bingley's Useful Knowledge, Bingley's Travellers, Readings in Biography, &c.”

Is this instruction of a stinted kind? Is there matter sufficient here to exercise the youthful mind during the full period that the

children of the working classes are commonly allowed by their parents, or by their necessary avocations in life, to remain at school? If such knowledge is communicated accurately and perfectly, is there not abundance of occupation here? And, if we have a moral result to show, or, if we have the evidence of competent witnesses (in the persons of the clergy) to vouch for it, have we reason to be dissatisfied with what has already been done? Certain we are, that those who consider the matter soberly and deliberately, looking into the subject and judging for themselves, however they may desire (as we ourselves most heartily desire) for improvement of every kind, will not consider that it is little which has been effected for education, or that sweeping and wholesale changes are necessary before England can be said to have schools for the poor. If erroneous impressions on this subject have got abroad *to any considerable extent*, (which appears very doubtful, notwithstanding the loudness of voice with which certain opinions have been proclaimed,) we are satisfied they have been produced by misrepresentations on the subject, which it is an imperative duty to expose. Gladly would we forego the invidious task of laying open to public view the very serious charges which attach to those who have put themselves foremost in the cry lately raised against existing schools, and the demand for others of a different sort; who require, not only that intellectual pursuits shall have a principal degree of attention in such new institutions, but that religion shall be excluded, at least religion under any particular form. We are well aware of the charge to which we make ourselves liable, the imputation of bigotry, of intolerance, of fear, of jealousy, and such like unworthy feelings, but it is a very small thing that we should be judged of men when the dearest interests of the people and the country are at stake.

We, therefore, propose to state some facts with regard to the Central Education Society, which appear to us to substantiate the serious charges already advanced against it in the House of Lords, and the allegations of the petition which was presented in that place. Upon a careful survey of the two productions\* which that Society has put forth, we hold that those charges were by no means such as might have been advanced. The religious bearings of the Society were then chiefly considered; whereas, we may show from the evidence which its own publications afford, not only, first, that its proceedings are objectionable in a religious light; but that, secondly, its works abound in mistaken and partial views of education in general; thirdly, in proofs of ignorance, especially unbecoming those who pretend to set others right;

\* Its "First Publication," and "Schools for the Working Classes, or, the Present State of Education among the Working People of England."

fourthly, in distinct indications of prejudice against the Church of England; and, fifthly, in an obvious want of candour and truth.

If the Society had confined itself, as it professes to do, to the publishing of information and statistical details, there can be no question that it might have effected considerable good, and that its proceedings would have gained the thanks of all, including the members of the National Church. And, so far as its labours of this description have gone, we are not disposed to complain. The former and the present condition of schools abroad;—the analysis and exhibition of laborious reports which are only accessible to the few,—facts respecting crime and education in France and other countries, or the social condition of the working classes at home, such like matters must produce interest, without exciting angry feelings; and if the Society had confined itself to such matters, it might have been well. But, even in producing these there is a pretension to novelty and to discovery, which is somewhat unbecoming in persons who are only reporting on the labours of other men, and there is a disregard to order and arrangement in the papers, which is far from creditable to the editors, though it may, indeed, be convenient as a cover for the opinions and assertions which the Society had no business, consistently with its professed character, to advance.

How far any pretensions to novelty or discovery may become the writers, or rather the editors, of such a work, can only be judged of by those to whom the history of schools is really known.

For ourselves, on turning accidentally to some notes which we made on occasion of an educational excursion to the British Museum a few years since, we were struck by a curious agreement between the Central Society's list of subjects discussed in 1837, and our own memorandum of topics, chiefly interesting to the public and the friends of education some hundred years ago. We are disposed to think, that if any one lays the following list, which is taken from our notes, by the side of the table of contents in the modern work, he will not suppose that imagination has been unduly at work in discovering the resemblance referred to:—

“ ‘The Way of Teaching the Latin Tongue.’ Ascham, 1751.

“ ‘Examination of Academies.’ 1753. And, ‘Advice for the Advancement of Real Learning, by W. P.’

“ ‘Petition of Grammar Schools to be released from all Rules, and have the Benefit of their Apprenticeships and Trades, as though they had served their Time and duly Studied at the University.’ 1642.

“ ‘An Academy wherein Young Ladies . . . may be preserved and secured till the Day of their Marriage . . . under a grave Society of Virgins who have resolved to live in a single retired way, &c.’ 1671.

“ ‘A Mite into the Treasury, being a Word to . . . the Heptatechnists.’ 1680.

“ ‘The Brains-breakers’ Breaker, or, the Apology of Thomas Grantham, &c.’ 1644.

“ ‘Efforts of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to improve Education in Workhouses, and to connect Works of Industry with Schools, with Statistical Tables of the Schools.’ Reports.

“ ‘Mr. Nedham’s Discourse and Appeal.’ 1663. Parliament exhorted to inquire into the Abuses of Endowments ;—Uniformity in Books enforced ;—Suggestions for the Improved Employment of Parish Clerks ;—Plan for bringing the Fellows of Colleges out into the World and making them Work ;—Increased efficiency of the Universities thereby ;—Abolition of Whipping, &c. &c.”

The last work is by far the most complete of its kind, and develops its plan of national improvement to an extent which is quite remarkable, considering the day when it appeared. Like its successors in criticism too, it dwells with great force on the remissness and indifference of mankind to the training of the young ; reminding us quaintly how true it is ;—

“ Nulla res minoris  
Constabit patri quam filius.”

“ Nothing shall stand the thrifty dad  
In less, than training of his lad ;”

and bewailing the miserable estate of schoolmasters with the contempt in which their office was held ;—so that the proverb appeared to be verified to the letter,—

“ Quem Jupiter odit, pædagogum facit.”

“ To whom a spite Jove takes  
Him pedagogue he makes.”

But we are by no means disposed to trifle with a subject of so serious a nature, or to imagine that we should be justified in supporting by any thing like ridicule the very grievous charges that have been advanced against a publication, the papers of which bear the names of many respectable and influential persons. To facts, then, we recur :—I. We object altogether to *the religious views, or rather the total want of religious views*, in the publications of the Central Society of Education. The principle avowed in the following passage is of course repugnant to the feelings of every friend of the Church :—

“ Important a part of education as religion forms, it is one upon which the Society, if it intends to effect good, must observe a strict neutrality ; religious controversy must be avoided. The contributions to the publications of the Society must, therefore, be confined to observations upon the cultivation of religious sentiments, without touching upon points of difference. The Society cannot allow the Church of England, the Church

of Scotland, the Church of Rome, or any class of Dissenters, to be attacked through its pages, for it has an assurance that if this rule is ever deviated from, they will become either an arena for opposing sects to contend in ; or, what is more likely, the representative of the opinions of one."—pp. 9, 10.

The following words have, indeed, a cheering sound, but betray a lamentable ignorance of the real corrective of all human sorrows and infirmities ;—we must assume, in the absence of all other instruction connected with religion, that this, and the annexed passage, contain the substitute which is proposed instead of the consolations of the Holy Spirit, and the correcting and renewing efficacy of divine grace :—

"England must not only be moral, industrious, intelligent, powerful England, but cheerful, happy England. The lively song must be heard again,—the active sport must be called back,—marked days must be kept as periodical remembrances of friendship and good will, when quarrels should be made up, and the peace of families restored. If you would do a thing, there is nothing like a fixed time for doing it in ; and although we would be good friends at all times, differences will arise ; therefore, let us have fixed periods for cementing old friendships and making new ones. . . . In France, New Year's day is a day for making up all quarrels and disagreements,—the interchanging of little presents,—things of no value but as proceeding from a kindly spirit."—p. 176.

" 'The prodigious effects of education,' says David Hume, ' may convince us, that the mind is not altogether stubborn and inflexible, but will admit of many alterations from its original make and structure. Let a man propose to himself the model of a character which he approves,—let him be well acquainted with those particulars in which his own character deviates from this model,—let him keep a constant watch over himself, and bend his mind, by a continual effort, from the vices towards the virtues,—and I doubt not but in time he will find in his temper an alteration for the better.' —*We can add nothing to this, nothing in reference either to the value of education, as the great lever with which to raise the social mass, or to its humbler but rare influence when well directed to check, and finally even to triumph over, criminal passions and desires.*"—!!—p. 289.

We leave the question of religion for the present, merely setting in contrast with these passages the more full and perfect scheme which we propose to ourselves in the training of children, as it is expressed in the words of one whose scientific honours entitle him to be heard and respected when he speaks in this cause :

"The great secret of right training lies in the always regarding the child as immortal. The moment that this is kept out of sight, we scheme and arrange as though the child had to live only upon earth ; and then our plans, not being commensurate with the destinies of their object, will necessarily be inadequate to the securing its good. Educate on the principle that you educate for eternity—otherwise it is impossible, that,



with all your pains, you should produce a beneficial result. If you educate only for the time; if you do not take care that every thing else shall be manifestly subordinate to preparation for an after-state of being; you virtually impress upon the young a lesson as to the importance of this world, irrespective of the next; and they will not be slow in inferring, however you may occasionally read them a lecture on religion, that you attach, in reality, a greater worth to earthly things than you seem willing in theory to allow. Whereas, if you contrive to make it evident, throughout the whole process of education, that you have but one aim, and that the aim of fitting for death and for judgment, the strong likelihood is, that the child will become so impressed with the importance of this aim, as to acquire a habit of taking it for its own.

"We know, of course, what will be immediately urged against such a theory of education as this. We shall be accused of rejecting all knowledge which is not strictly religious, and of laying an interdict upon various acquirements, and still more upon various accomplishments. But the accusation is unfounded, and shows forgetfulness or ignorance of a great truth, namely, that religion adds a fresh interest to every thing worth knowing, and a fresh grace to every thing worth doing."—*Rev. H. Melvill's Sermon*, 1838, pp. 13, 14.

But the feelings of the Central Society are more fully developed in its Second Publication. In that work, the objections to teaching writing on the Lord's day are held up to ridicule as the peculiar notions of the evangelical party in the Church, though it is an objection with all, pp. 13, 14: the efforts of a dissenting school at Stockport, where the contrary plan is pursued, are approved, p. 15: we have a kind of joke set forth in the countrified speech of a poor Sunday-schoolmaster who had lost the help of the curate's daughters by their death, (probably, it is suggested, from attending the school), p. 14: sneers are thrown out against Sunday-school teachers, than whom there is hardly a more devoted class of people in the country, p. 16: and the natural indisposition of the heart to religion, which a Sunday-school Society had described in the very words of the Bible, is brought forward as a plain proof that the instruction given in the school must be wretchedly bad, because it is so distasteful to the children.

II. Independently of religion, the work *abounds in partial and mistaken views* of the subject of which it treats. A specimen only can be given here.

The system of composition and other exercises in our higher class of schools are objected to, and something which may turn more easily and readily to account in the world is proposed, p. 8; as though the immediate fruits of knowledge, instead of the discipline of the mind, were the thing to be desired in schools. And

on this kind of foundation, a good deal of what is plausible is made to rest.

Of a similar nature are the following propositions, which will doubtless be new to many of our readers. "The studies of young persons are for the purpose . . . of giving them a lively interest in the world they are entering upon, (compare 1 John, ii. 15—17); . . . they are too for enabling their parents and preceptors to discover what the peculiar bents of their minds are, so that the study chosen for them may be one in which they will probably succeed," p. 9. In pursuance of this principle, it is proposed "to introduce professional studies into preparatory education, and thus familiarise the mind to the peculiar class of ideas which, in after life, must so greatly occupy it," p. 19. "At present (we are told) all early associations receive a shock;" viz. by the change in the subject of study as life advances; "such is the position of a young man who comes from the successful prosecution of his educational studies to a conveyancer's or special pleader's chambers"!!

These principles, be it remembered, are taken from the leading article in the publication which sets forth the Society's designs. And, who indeed shall wonder to find such recommendations, when he knows the definition of education which a chief mover in the Society (Mr. Wyse) deliberately propounds in his writings?—"that which enables each citizen most perfectly to fulfil the various duties which his several stations in society, public and private, enforce upon him, by giving to the physical, intellectual, and moral faculties, the full perfection of which they are susceptible," (*without the remotest reference to the ultimate destinies of man.*)

Need we adduce further instances of partial and mistaken views, when a society for improving the education of the country proceeds on such principles as these?

III. There are *proofs of ignorance* in the publications unbecoming any persons who ought to understand a subject upon which they write, and more especially unseemly in those who profess to teach the teachers of England what things they should do. It may seem a small thing in the eyes of the public, but those who understand the system of education now at work in the country will not deem it such, that the idea of selecting teachers (monitors) out of the class they are to teach, is held up to ridicule.\* Why, where is the thing done? The rule and principle of the system is, that monitors shall always be taken from the first or highest class.—So, the circulating system is praised because there is no bottom to the class, and the worst scholar is spared the re-

\* Schools for the Industrious Classes, p. 23.

proach of standing the last ; whereas the system is objectionable for this very reason, that the worst scholar is driven down, circle after circle, and bears on his breast a badge indicative of his disgrace ; and the best scholar is tempted to pride by the list of honorary circles which he moves up, and proclaims by his badge. In short, so far from avoiding depression, the principle of excitement and depression is too strongly and largely introduced into the whole school.

What else can we account it but a proof of ignorance, that while much is said of lending libraries, and, in describing the Ealing\* school, we have an account (as a novelty !) of a *boy librarian*, no reference is made to the very numerous libraries in connexion with existing national schools, together with the plan of acting through the medium of children, and teaching them to be useful in every possible way, which is the very essence of the system of mutual tuition, viz. that the children are to work all the mechanical details of the school business, and the master is to be free to superintend and direct and control the whole.

In like manner, evening instruction in connexion with Sunday or daily national schools, is treated as a novelty, a sort of discovery. Again, a kind of apprenticeship system in connexion with schools, which the National Society's reports had long since told us was tried at Liverpool and at York, is brought forward as a new idea.† So also, a whole essay is devoted to vocal music considered as a branch of national education, without a syllable to indicate that a work‡ has been expressly prepared for effecting this very thing which is desired in national schools ; that there had been a great demand for the work ; that singing has been taught scientifically in the Marylebone, and Philological, and Clergy Orphan Schools, and is actually in operation at the National Society's Central School. If it is not attributable to ignorance, that the results of other men's labours are passed over thus, we fear that some motive of a more objectionable description must be assigned. Again ; who would have supposed from the article, "Industrial Schools for the Peasantry," that the whole subject had been fully and impartially considered by the National Society, the principles carried out extensively into effect, and a Report printed on the subject many years ago. For ourselves, we do not scruple to assert, that the paper on works of industry connected with National Schools put forth by the Society in 1833, contains far more information, more clearly and systematically arranged, than the essay composed expressly in 1837 for the purpose of showing

\* First Publication, p. 188.

† Schools for the Industrious Classes, pp. 70, 71.

‡ Manual of Instruction in Psalmody. By J. Turner, Esq. Published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

how little has been done in this particular department, and enlightening the public on the subject. We are tempted to give the following abstract in proof of what we state ;—

“ The Society's publication gives the objections and the answers against and for the plan of industrial schools ; it then gives an interesting specimen of what may be effected, by an account of the Royal Military School at Chelsea ; and it afterwards enlarges, with many particular and useful hints, on the following works, which are more or less adapted to the object desired :—*Needlework*, with details of the Rutland Society, its prizes and plan of operations ; *Household-work*, with accounts from the poor reports, vol. vi. ; *Knitting*, as practised by boys, as well as girls, in many national schools ; *Netting*, with an account of its success in Northleach school ; *Tailors' work*, practised in several national schools ; *Straw-platting*, with particulars respecting the plat ; *Spinning, weaving and winding*, as in the Hastings, Glasbury and Rutland schools, &c. ; *Covering and stitching books*, as in the Twickenham school ; *Printing*, with particulars from Gower's Walk ; *Basket-making* ; account from the Liverpool Blind Asylum ; *Rush-platting for mats, baskets, &c.* ; *Gardening and agriculture*, with details from the Thames Ditton school. Under the last head, is a reference to the village agricultural school at Carra, near Geneva, established by M. Vernet, a relative of the late professor Pictet, which the Central Society of Education announces as the school of M. Vernet Pietat.”—*First Publication*, p. 204.

When, therefore, the Society tells us, “ such, as far as they have come to our knowledge, are the first attempts which have been made in the country ”\* of this kind, we can only lament that the books of the National Society were not consulted before the labours of the institution were misrepresented and spoken of with contempt. When it informs us, that “ in national schools works of industry may be introduced, without affecting their exclusive character,”—we ask the Society's editor, did you never read what was put forth in the First Publication of the National Society, and has been always reprinted with the paper on the subject since 1833 ?

“ It may not be superfluous, to call the attention of the public to this peculiar advantage resulting from its admirable mechanism, that the instruction necessary for the lower orders of society is so expeditiously afforded, as to leave ample leisure for the daily exercise of manual labour. . . . . A conviction of the superabundance of time at the disposal of schoolmasters, has induced the managers of certain schools to seek for variety of employment,” &c.

Or, has the work-book of the Society never fallen in his way ? wherein we read on the first page,—

“ At the Central School, all the regulations respecting needlework and knitting are formed on the principles of the Madras system, as

\* First Publication, p. 201.

taught in Dr. Bell's Manual of Instructions. . . . The children are classed according to their proficiency in needlework, &c. . . . an assistant teacher to each of the three sides of the class, . . . a teacher superintends the whole, . . . is responsible to the schoolmistress for all," &c.

And, whose thanks, then, does he expect, for announcing the mysterious discovery that works of industry are not inconsistent with the principles of mutual instruction, or the exclusive (religious?) character of our schools? Whatever the friends of the Central Society may feel, we are sure that the public may be somewhat surprised to know that some of the institutions he sets out in array for their instruction and imitation, such as Springfield,\* Winkfield,† &c. are in union with the National Society, and were actually established by aid of the Society's own funds.

We have none of the vain ambition of arrogating all inventions and improvements to the Church by these remarks. We are simply stating facts which may be verified by public documents, and by which our character for truth may stand or fall.

IV. But there are proofs against the Central Society of *prejudice against the Church*. For instance, we deem it such to describe both societies, National and British, as the patrons of intellectual instruction‡ only, (which is not correct); and after praising the British Central School for its superiority, to lament that no attention is paid in it to *singing*, and neglect to state that its rival gives an example in this respect!—And, to dwell upon the provision which might be made for mechanics by books and reading-rooms, without any notice of what has been effected by the National Society's agents in this way at Bath, and Chichester, and Coventry, and elsewhere!§ Do the friends of Church schools admit, that “the number of schools, not the quality of instruction given in them,”|| has hitherto been the subject of their appeal? Then, why charge against them so offensive a statement, which cannot be substantiated when denied? “Trinitarians and Unitarians,” the public are informed, “find it impossible to unite even for teaching reading and writing and arithmetic.”¶ “Children's feelings are embittered by theological controversy in our schools.”\*\*\* Is this to hold off from the subject of religion, and observe neutrality,—or to attack the chief patrons of religious instruction, the friends of the Church? So we are informed that Mr. Lancaster established “the model school in the Borough Road. Subsequently, Dr. Bell came over from Madras.”†† It is difficult to conceive any other motive for such an assertion than

\* First Publication, p. 192.

† p. 189.

‡ pp. 172, 173.

§ p. 2.

|| See National Society's Report, 1837, pp. 50, 57, 62, &c.

¶ Schools for the Industrious Classes, p. 8.

\*\* p. 10.

†† p. 21.

a design of traducing the pretensions of the Church. In the like spirit we are told, that the sum total of the instruction given at the Central School is of such and such a kind,\* a quotation being made from the Society's Report;—we turn to the Report, and find that the fact is not so, but it is stated, that every child is expected to know the matters (religious) referred to, while other lessons are always taught. In a like spirit, a little book on arithmetic, which contains some examples from Scriptural facts, is ridiculed as most unfit for use in the Central School, and the *reverend* secretary of the Society, who compiled it, is sufficiently jeered. Who would suppose, after this, that the book never has been, and probably never will be, used in the Central School at all? Yet, such is the fact. Who would imagine that the title-page and first words of the preface proclaim that the book was written with another design, and is not adapted for general use in schools? It is written for adults, to *explain the* “*first principles* of a science which they are to teach others,” and *not for the children*.

In the article on the progress and prospects of education in the United Kingdom, the writer devotes a large space (eighteen pages) to Scotch schools, half as much to Irish schools, and, when he comes to those of England and Wales, laments that “the limits of his paper preclude the possibility of going into detail respecting them.”† But there were other obvious reasons why it was inconvenient to do this. He would have had to tell (as the extract we have already given shows) of the indefatigable exertions of the Church of England and the clergy in this work. Or else, where English education is the chief object of the Central Society's regard, why did he pass over the very matter on which it was important that he should touch?

V. With regard to *the want of candour and truth* which is betrayed in many parts of the Society's two works, we may refer briefly to the hasty admissions which are constantly made of what the Church has done, and which are uniformly followed by a virtual contradiction of the admission in the form of uncompromising abuse of her schools.‡ The Second Publication is described in the following words by a review, which generally approves of the object with which the Society was formed.

“The author in it has carried out the statistical system with a vengeance, and with irresistible drollery given the examination of the fifty-three witnesses for National School Education; consisting of all the low idle vagabonds that could be pounced upon in the public streets. From the mouths of these witnesses the education of the National and British and Foreign Schools is adjudged to be worse than no education at all;

\* Schools for the Industrious Classes, p. 26.

† First Publication, p. 58.

‡ See pp. 11, 28, 29, 277, &c.

and the author indulges himself in many deprecatory remarks on the National and British systems in a manner so outrageous and vulgar, as to be disgusting to the reader, and offensive to every well-regulated mind. Much that is embodied in the pamphlet is undoubtedly true ; but you may speak truth with a view to offend, or with a view to amend : the author has chosen the former method."

A violent attack is made in this work upon the school in Baldwin's Gardens, which was formerly the National Society's Central School. The secretaries, who gratuitously devote their time and services to the schools, have thought it deserving of an answer. Other persons have not done so in their own case ; but we may judge by this example of the violence done to the feelings of benevolent people through the hasty and unfounded abuse which, if we may not say the Central Society has sanctioned, yet for which it is made responsible, through the editors it appoints.

"A pamphlet has recently been published under the sanction of the Central Society of Education, entitled 'Schools for the Industrious Classes,' which abounds with the most exaggerated statements respecting existing schools, and the present system of education throughout the country ; and as the author has made several direct and specific charges against the National School in Baldwin's Gardens, we have thought it our duty, by showing the unfounded nature of these charges, to satisfy the minds of the supporters of this Institution in particular, and at the same time to put readers in general on their guard, as to the credit which is due to other parts of the work.

"The first statement, to which we will reply, is in the following words :—

" 'The utility of the school in Baldwin's Gardens, in the midst of a dense Irish population, is almost destroyed by the narrow and contracted basis upon which the school is established. Although there are one or two catholic boys in the school, hundreds who would attend are kept away by their priests, who, as might have been expected, denounce (and not unreasonably) parents who suffer their children to attend and join in an anti-catholic form of worship.'—*Second Edit.* p. 22.

"This statement can only have originated in the desire, obvious through the whole book, to depreciate by every possible means the usefulness and efficiency of existing schools. A very short answer will suffice. The school is not situated in the midst of a dense Irish population ; there are very few Irish families in its immediate vicinity on any side ; and, moreover, the number of Roman Catholics in the school is greatly understated ; there are now nearly thirty children of Irish and Italian parents in the school, one or both of whose parents are, it is believed, Roman Catholics, and there are also a good many children of Dissenters and Jews ; but if it were otherwise, the usefulness of the school could not on that account be justly impugned, for there are as many children in it as the rooms are calculated to accommodate, and they are frequently crowded to inconvenience."

The second charge is refuted as fully and plainly as the former.

Having alluded to the opinion expressed in the upper House of Parliament respecting this Society, we must here add, that whatever noble lords, who are friendly to its principles, (which we have illustrated through the medium of its own statements,) may say, there "must be a feeling of distrust in the public mind in regard to its operations." We cannot admit that "its publications are put forth *merely* as means of acquainting the public with the various propositions which have been made with regard to education."\* It could have been nothing but want of information which induced a noble advocate to say, that "in these publications the utmost care has been taken to abstain from the expression of opinion, but the greatest anxiety is manifested to provide facts and information from which important conclusions may be drawn."

It is not needful for us to express any further opinion on the Central Society. But there are some inferences deducible from the attacks of this Association, and of various other persons or parties who are like-minded with it, which it would not become us to pass over entirely.

The Church and the Clergy are not in good odour with those we refer to, because they have done and are doing too much to suit their views and desires. The Church has an influence and connexion formed throughout the country which they find very embarrassing. *Their* "schemes would go far towards dissociating religion from the instruction given to the people. We, therefore, regard those schemes as hostile to the Christianity of our land;" and our exertions in behalf of this same religion are equally opposed to their plans. We would have our schools to be, "as those of Edward VI. and of Elizabeth were before them, the feeders of the Established Church;" and, if the members of that Church are true to their own cause, there is nothing to prevent the main body of schools throughout the country being of this description. This fact being pretty well understood in the present day, there is nothing left to prevent such a result, but to attack the character of existing schools; to endeavour to make out a case of misapplication in regard to the charitable endowments which were left to the Church for its special benefit; and, assuming as a fact that the Church is contented with the present state of educational affairs, to call upon authorities to wrest her power from her hands, or else, to create such a controlling influence as shall virtually destroy that power. We have so often

\* Mirror, Part 442, pp. 274, 275.



had occasion to expose these views and designs, that we deem it irrelevant to recite our arguments :\* but it is due to the National Society to state distinctly, that it has proclaimed, as plainly as words can express, that it is by no means satisfied, as a final result, with what has been done hitherto. There is a long passage from its annual Report, in our article referred to, in which it expressly says as much. That passage is brought forward, and urged again on public attention in the Society's Report for 1835, p. 17. The extraordinary want of schools, as proved by the Education-inquiry, 1833, is pointed out, Report 1836. The declaration is renewed in a statement transmitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Model Schools, and printed in Report for 1836, p. 57. Plans are repeatedly suggested for improving schools ; the necessity of better salaries, for an improved set of teachers, is urged, Report, 1835 ; and the Queen's Letter, recently in the course of circulation throughout the country, recited the Society's own feeling complaint and prayer, that its hands might be strengthened, in order that its work might be better accomplished.

But the importance of the subject has betrayed us to an undue length, and our remarks must be brought to a close. We have only room to enumerate what we proposed to have discussed at some length, as a sequel to the preceding remarks ; viz. first, the schemes for the improvement of education which are afloat ; secondly, the bearings of those schemes, which are fatal, as we apprehend, to their success : and, thirdly, the course which we hope, and are disposed to think, the government will adopt.

We have read of four schemes differing a little in the extent of their interference with existing plans and institutions. Of these we enumerate, 1st, as requiring the greatest changes, that which the Central Society propounds.

It can "anticipate no measures equal to the emergency of the case unless the subject be taken up by her majesty's government."† "Central national organization is the great thing ;" "a proper department with a minister and council are required"—"large powers over new and old endowments."‡ It doubts whether the country would, for the present, "permit a system of compulsory education to be adopted ;" but suggests some intermediate measures. . . . "The government may hold out civil advantages to those who have been educated, and impose disabilities on those who have not, &c. . . . A law might then be passed, without difficulty, which would lay the foundation of the . . . prosperity of the country.§ So that compulsory education (which is defended by the practice of the Court of

\* See particularly our article IX., in No. XXXV. for July, 1835.

† First Publication, p. 212.

‡ pp. 62, 63.

§ p. 14.

Chancery in certain particulars) is the one thing needed and desired; and the adoption of local taxes for the purpose at once is deliberately proposed."§

2. Lord Brougham's plan stands next, which, being embodied in the form of a bill, is sufficiently before the public. It rejects all ideas of direct compulsion, proposes a commission with extensive duties,—a system of enrolling schools under the Commission, by which they shall become entitled to certain privileges;—officers, called inspectors of schools;—special arrangements for the benefit of towns having municipal corporations; and various other details. A kind of commentary, favourable to the bill, has appeared in the last *Edinburgh Review*; and its supposed defects have been pointed out in the Preface to Mr. L. Horner's translation of M. Cousin's work on the schools of Holland.

3. A more moderate scheme, as regards the degree of interference with existing institutions, has been put forth in the *Educational Magazine*, and is stated thus :

"We think that under the present circumstances of the country much can be done. Education must be made a government measure, which should be as ready to prevent crime as to punish it. Let societies exist, and let the government work through them, with a proviso that certain branches of education shall be imparted; and that certain institutions, Normal schools, shall be raised for the full and competent training of teachers. Let the Church have their schools, and the Dissenters have their schools; but let the government compel both to carry out comprehensive plans, and insist upon the elements of geography and English history, linear drawing, and the first truths of natural philosophy, being taught by the aid of books properly drawn up, pictures, maps, lessons, and apparatus. Let the government provide funds, and state what they would have done, and there will be no difficulty. Let them prohibit sham schools being formed, in which the word of promise is kept to the ear, but broken to the hope. Let inspectors be selected to examine every school at stated periods; and let there be a proper scale of payment for teachers, and a provision for old age. But let no teacher be elected without having passed a board of examiners, such as a young surgeon is obliged to undergo."

4. We certainly were surprised to find that our own pages had unintentionally given birth to a scheme at all, but the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society has called us in to subserve his own opinions, and he is welcome to such aid as he can borrow from us, though we see obvious difficulties in his proposal.

"An idea has been thrown out in a number of the *British Critic*, which strikes me as worthy of regard, viz., the appointment of a Minister

† First Publication, p. 23.

of Public Instruction, not indeed a Schoolmaster-General of the kingdom, but to form a connecting link between the government and the country, holding a *bureau* of central communication and general intercourse; the visitor for statistical purposes of all Public Seminaries and Educational Establishments; a collector of educational facts, and a depository of educational suggestions, with a view to the supply of deficiencies and the extension of benefits. If, under the control of such an officer of state, three working commissioners were appointed, one to represent the interests of the National Society, one connected with the British and Foreign School Society, and one selected to represent the opinions of those gentlemen who are not disposed to approve of either, and if all applications for aid, whether from the two societies or elsewhere, were thoroughly investigated by them, I think that without the help of any penalties they might obtain access for their inspectors to almost every school in the kingdom,—might elevate and improve existing establishments, and, in connection with local effort, promote to an unlimited extent the opening of new ones. Understanding, as they would, the grounds on which voluntary subscriptions are offered, they would be able not only to secure the present amount of contributions, but to develop still more widely the benevolent resources of the country.”\*

What shall we argue from such a multiplicity of plans?—Certainly not that the remedy for the supposed disease is simple and sure;—not that the practitioners understand the case. Each takes great pains to show that his own advice is right, and that the others are wrong. The Central Society would do away with existing societies altogether; Lord Brougham would have the power of controlling or superseding their operations, or leaving them to their own unaided exertions, as the commissioners might think fit. The third scheme (inconsistently enough) would preserve them as voluntary agents, but fetter them with laws,—Mr. Dunn would identify them with the government itself. Other discrepancies in abundance may be pointed out in their plans; it is enough for us to see that “doctors differ,” and we infer that they do not understand the disease of the patient,—they all promise to cure. But we have no space to discuss the respective merits of the plans. They all involve expenses which must be fatal to their success when brought under the Chancellor of the Exchequer’s eyes;—and they all involve religious considerations which must be equally fatal to them with the country at large. We have already shown at what price the country is to buy the advantages which are promised on the good faith of speculators who, we doubt not, believe every word they say. Centralized organization may be had for a few hundred thousands pounds a year, or in terms more emphatic, “England’s intellectual regeneration may be effected for the

\* National Education the Question of Questions, by Mr. Henry Dunn, 1838.

mere sum it cost us to set free our West Indian slaves?" If this were all, we apprehend the House of Commons would consider it enough, but the Central Society of Education would be very far from content. Besides what this involves, it has nobler schemes in view; \*—the salaries for the teachers must not be what they now are, *but good*;—there must be various collateral aids in the work;—"schools of design," with normal schools;—special aid for mechanics' institutes;—museums throughout the country furnished forth by the state;—schools for the special benefit of juvenile offenders, "houses of detention" they are to be called, where the unfortunate children may be supported and trained, and sent out into the world reformed characters;—there is moreover a workhouse scheme, and a scheme for providing new courts in large towns, under another responsible minister of justice, who should have gaols under his control, &c.

Away then with the calculating economy of modern times!—Let the means be supplied, and let education do its perfect work! We should really anticipate great results from men of such splendid comprehensive views, if we did not observe that the whole expense was to be thrown upon the shoulders of government, and that the advocates of the measures themselves hold their own purses very tightly clasped. We scarcely remember a popular society which has come forward with such magnificent pretensions, and such straightened resources, as this same Central Society from which all these plans proceed.

But if this, or any other of the projected societies, were prepared to do its own work, and pay for the expenses it occasions, we apprehend that a voice would be heard from the religious portion of the community, which would cause very formidable obstructions in its proceedings. It has a plausible sound, in a parliamentary debate, when it is said, the schools shall be religious schools, the Bible shall be read, all children shall of necessity study it, except, perhaps, a few Roman Catholics or Jews, whose parents may object. But, such kind of accommodation and concession falls very far short of the requirements which thoughtful religious persons are prepared to make. They choose that religion, the religion of Christ Jesus, in a distinct substantive form, should not be hooked on as a collateral branch of tuition, an appendage in its train, but should form the basis and groundwork of the business of the schools. They will not submit "to substitute secular knowledge as the refining principle of the country, for the wisdom which is from above: or compendiums of political economy for the word

\* First Publication; see the plans in succession, pp. 41, 244, 250, 251, 281, 282, 283, 290, &c.

of God.”\* They despise “those much vaunted systems which deal with the intellect and let alone the heart, or propose to polish the metal without attempting to refine it.”† They require that, in all education, the corruptions of our nature, and the immortality of our souls, should be the first elements taken into account; and, therefore, they make the intellectual advancement of the pupil subordinate to his moral improvement; yet though subordinate, they would not have it overlooked, “for whatever principle serves to kill the lusts of the heart, serves to open the eyes of the understanding too.” “Man arrives at the highest intellectual elevation of which he is capable through the cultivation of his moral affections.” The language of Scripture and the language of the world are opposed. “*Wisdom*, as understood in the Bible, is a principle of fear and love working in God’s creatures. *Knowledge*, is a knowledge of God, of his nature and attributes, of his claims upon us and our duties to him; and other acquirements, even those upon which the world spends all its strength, are there sunk and disregarded, as vain.”‡ The object of those who have hitherto been the chief promoters of education, has been to teach men to make a conscience of their ways, and to prepare and qualify them for that state which shall then only begin when the transitory things of this present world have all passed away. Nor will they, for the hope of any temporal and intellectual advantages, forego any portion of this great and important design. For this purpose, to satisfy their own consciences that they may do the work of God, not deceitfully, but fully and effectually to the saving of souls, they must have all those manifold truths unfolded to the understanding of their pupils, so far as the wisdom of God has seen fit to direct.—“True,” say the advocates for the school of universal adaptation,—“true, have religious instruction as much as you please, but do not adopt any particular form of faith; take the general principles of Christianity which are best suited to a general plan of education; but do not obtrude on all scholars the peculiar principles of the Church of England;—be content with the general principles of the Church of Christ.”

“But I ask in the first place, how are these general principles *to be applied*; for it is with their application that we are here concerned?—I may have general notions of a house, but I must have a specific plan when I build one. I may have general notions of astronomy, but I must adopt a specific system when I teach it: and I may have general

\* See an admirable sermon by Rev. J. J. Blunt. “Useful Knowledge no Substitute for Religious Knowledge, in a scheme for National Education.” Murray.

† Sermon by Rev. H. Melvill. “Religious Education.” Rivingtons.

‡ Blunt’s Sermon.

ideas of Christianity, but I must prefer one mode of it to another, when I set myself to form a Christian. But I would further ask, what those general principles of Christianity are of which we hear so much?—I find all Christians, to be sure, professing to acknowledge the Bible for their common authority: yet, whilst they do so, I find some denying their original sin; some the Godhead of the Son; some the need or efficacy of the atonement; some the influence, some the very being of the Holy Ghost. I find some declaring against the baptism of infants; some against elemental baptism at all; some against the supper of the Lord, as commemorative of the *sacrifice* of Christ's death. I find some for many sacraments; some for none whatever. I find some for an ordained ministry, as the covenanted channel through which God's special grace has been conveyed to his people from the apostles downwards; and some for allowing any man to take the honour to himself *not* as did Aaron. Now I would know what kind of Christianity that would be, and whether it would be of a kind to satisfy St. Paul, which must be so indefinite in its character, in its nature so abstract, as to be consistent with the suppression, for the sake of peace, of all mention of the corruption of man, of the Godhead of the Son, of the atonement of his blood, of the person and office of the Comforter, of baptism, of the supper of the Lord, of a priesthood. Doubtless, as much as in us lies, we are to live peacefully with all men, but the restriction implies that peace, though more to be desired than gold, may like gold be bought too dear. . . . . If there are texts which teach concession, there are others (though in these days much less heard of) which teach steadfastness; though *unity* is the second thing in the world to long for, still *truth* is the first. But follow the principle out, and it would deprive us of the use of even Scripture itself as an element of education; for if no one mode of interpreting Scripture is to be resolved on, because there are those who do not allow that interpretation; so neither should Scripture itself be *admitted* into our schools, because there are those who dispute its truths."—*Rev. J. J. Blunt's Sermon.*

We have nothing to add to these sensible observations excepting this, that Mr. Dunn's remarks (in his essay, entitled *National Education the Question of Questions*, especially where he deals with the religious difficulties of the case, and speaks of the Bible as an universal text-book, adapted to the use of all schools,) are a practical illustration of the truth of what Mr. Blunt asserts. In pp. 34, 35, his treatment of the Catholic, the Unitarian, the Jew (not to name the unbeliever), is a clear proof that there is no such thing as a Christianity for schools which can be suitable or palatable to all. Any violent attempt to force a system upon the country which should involve this absurdity, must necessarily have the effect of rendering the existing societies of education still more exclusive and sectarian in their character (if these epithets apply) than they are at the present time.

We have already recorded our opinion on this subject,\* which it would be useless to repeat; but if the system of direct interference with existing schools were carried into operation, certain we are that the different religious societies from which those institutions have originated, would give up all except the directly religious part of the work they have in hand. If, for instance, a general plan of intellectual instruction were enforced under government control, (accompanied though it might be by the reading of the Bible,) the National Society, which is maintained solely and exclusively as the organ and agent of the Church, must confine its operations, and the assistance it gives, to Sunday-schools; those grants which have hitherto been freely expended in aid of the general cause, and in multiplying the school-rooms, with which the face of the country is becoming thickly studded, must henceforward be exclusively appropriated to the encouraging and securing, by various methods, of the particular instructions which are connected with the doctrines and discipline of the established Church upon the Lord's day. And in various other ways would evils of a like or worse character be introduced, and the well-organized system which is now at work be disturbed or possibly destroyed.

It remains only to state the methods by any or all of which education might be improved and its advancement accelerated, by a simple extension of a plan which has been tried with great success at a comparatively moderate expense, and without any of those risks which are inseparable from the specious theories of the day. In every case voluntary subscription and expenditure of local means might be required as indispensable for obtaining the public money.

1. *The present system of parliamentary grants may be extended, upon a more reasonable and equitable plan, due attention being paid to large towns, and to the outlay of the local promoters upon the work to be assisted.*

The system now pursued by the Treasury is fair to all parties, inasmuch as all applications, whether from British or National schools, are disposed of on equal terms, according to the time when they are received. But it is unequal and injudicious, inasmuch as £1 for every two scholars to be accommodated in the school-rooms, is the maximum given in any case. Thus a school built by the side of a stone quarry, on a piece of the waste land, where labour is the principal expense, obtains assistance at the same rate as a school in the centre of Manchester, the site of which alone may cost £1000 or £1500, and where expensive materials must be bought and carried to the spot. The reply at the Treasury to this remark would probably be of this kind—'Very true, it

\* July, 1835, No. XXXV. Art. IX. pp. 193 and 207.

is hard in theory, but in practice we find that almost all our offers of grants are accepted, and the school-rooms are built.' This is correct, we believe; but then it is equally true that only one school-room is built in a town where six or eight or more school-rooms are required. The local promoters can build one school-room with such assistance as has been given, but their resources are then exhausted, and they cannot proceed with the work of building as the wants of the population require. We trust that the committee on education in large towns, which is now sitting, will have an eye to this statement.

2. *A considerable extension of the plan now in operation may be made with a view to a higher kind of self-supporting school for the children of those who are above the working classes.*

It is true that, as matters now stand, there is nothing to prevent the two education societies from recommending such schools to participate in the present grants. But there are many reasons why the promoters of such institutions might not choose to identify themselves with societies of a charitable description. And it would undoubtedly give a considerable stimulus to the forming of such a new and useful kind of school, if a separate grant (say £10,000 only at first) were set apart especially for the service. There would be little difficulty, we presume, with the Treasury, in accepting certificates or reports from King's College and University College, showing that the applications were such as deserved to be entertained. The institutions to be so assisted must, of course, be limited as to the charges they were allowed to fix for instruction, and other necessary provisions made in order to secure their benefits to the class of persons for whom they were designed.

3. *A very beneficial mode of extending the present system of grants would be by aiding in the erection of dwelling-houses for the teachers of schools.*

The low amount of salary now given to schoolmasters and mistresses is a chief cause of difficulty in finding proper persons for the office. The addition of a house would be more than equal to an endowment of £5 or £6 a year. There are few things which add so much to the respectability of an office as a comfortable house. Our opinion on this point may be collected from what we stated in July, 1835.\* The recommendation for a grant for this object might pass through the same channel as that for the school-room does at present; and the property might be vested for the benefit of the institution in the hands of the same trustees. The recent school-site act provides the requisite powers.

4. *Grants for the improvement or extension, or in aid of founding model or normal schools, have already been voted, and might with advantage be appropriated again exclusively to this object.*

The former grants here referred to were available for schools in Scotland as well as model schools in England. The National Society

\* No. XXXV. pp. 197, 198.



applied for the benefit of the grant, but the petition was passed over, and the money appropriated to Scotch schools exclusively;\* on what grounds we are not aware. Certain it is, that the National Society has no less than forty model or central schools, any or all of which might easily be improved and placed upon a footing altogether becoming the service for which they are constituted, by the aid of a limited public grant. And other societies, there can be no doubt, would gladly extend the sphere of their operations, and carry similar plans into execution, from which they are only withheld by the want of funds.

The following account of the Glasgow Model School is introduced as a specimen of the kind of institution, some four or five of which ought to be immediately formed under the direction and control of the Church, out of the existing Central training schools:—

“The seminary will consist of infant, juvenile, and commercial schools; a female school of industry, with one class-room to each model-school, and thirteen for training the Normal students; also rector's-hall, museum, library, and committee-rooms; each of the model-schools to have a play-ground for healthful exercise and moral superintendence. Such an establishment required a much larger space of ground than could easily be procured, except at a most extravagant price, contiguous to a dense population of the working classes. A small field was fixed on,—value 2540*l.*,—and purchased at a moderate price per square yard. The situation is Dundas Vale,—in the immediate vicinity of a large manufacturing population.

“The buildings when completed, including the ground, will cost 9000*l.* At present, however, as government has declined giving any answer to the applications made, the committee are proceeding with the two great wings, embracing two-thirds of the proposed buildings, at a cost of about 6500*l.*, leaving the rector's-hall, library, museum, and several other rooms, unprovided. The four model-schools, with seventeen class-rooms, and two teachers' houses, are embraced in the two wings.

“In these buildings there will be accommodation for the daily training of one hundred teachers and above one thousand children, with every arrangement fitted to render the seminary a complete school-masters' college for the training of the teachers of youth.

“Besides salaries for the model-school teachers, a music-master, and one or two other masters for the Normal students, a respectable salary must be provided the rector, so that a permanent endowment will be required of at least 700*l.* a year, in addition to the small fees that are expected from the scholars. With the increased accommodation the new buildings afford, the committee will be enabled to carry out the training system to its fullest extent,—a system already so successful, and so calculated morally to elevate the whole mass of the population; for while it embraces the best elementary and scientific instructions, its foundations are, at the same time, laid broad and deep in the Scriptures of

\* See National Society's Report, 1836, Appendix, VIII.

divine truth,—on the principle of our ancient parochial school system.”  
—*Glasgow Educational Report*, 1836, p. 22, &c.

5. *Grants in aid of prizes upon the examination of a given number of schools, with a salary or fee to inspectors, would be extremely useful at the present time.*

The plan we have before our minds is stated in detail in all of the National Society's reports.\* The whole process is laid out there. It is very effective in some parts of the country, and would be so in all parts, if there were funds and sufficient prizes offered, nor would the promoters of schools hesitate to subscribe and meet grants offered for such a purpose. Lord Brougham's bill involves the appointment of a number of inspectors far more than would be sufficient to do all the work of this kind which we contemplate. In fact, the clergy, with other helpers, might do it themselves. Their certificates are deemed sufficient for obtaining the payment of the school-room grants; and they are already accustomed to make reports upon which, from time to time, the National Society votes small grants for prizes in the manner here proposed. Suppose that six grants were assigned to each county, three of 5*l.* each, two of 10*l.* each, and one of 20*l.*, to be given away, with some increase from the county education fund, as prizes to the best schools, upon an accurate report of the examination of not less than forty or fifty different schools, after the plan which the National Society has pursued, the report to be certified by that or the British Society (or both, where both schools existed) as satisfactory and correct. The whole expense to the country would be less than 3000*l.* a year; and we are satisfied that the stimulus, trifling as it appears and really is, would suffice, nevertheless, to call forth a degree of exertion on the part of the teachers, (and even of the clergy, who would be kindly disposed to aid those who are their own helpers in the teaching and training of the young,) which would have a highly beneficial effect.

6. *The last item we propose is the aiding in the purchase of playgrounds adjoining school-rooms, especially in large towns, for the purposes of healthy exercise to the children, and in order that they may be under some kind of superintendence during the hours of recreation.*

It would lead us into matter of inconvenient length to justify the recommendation to this effect. We trust that it may be taken up by the Committee of the House of Commons to which we have referred. But we willingly embrace the opportunity of offering our humble tribute of praise to the exertions and tact of the Educational Committee at Glasgow. They have drawn attention to this subject in a forcible manner. They have suggested many valuable improvements in the system of education which are mainly dependent on the turning of the play-ground to its proper account. They would have it made the means of acquiring a knowledge of the habits and disposition of the

\* See Appendix (every year) on District Societies and Examination of Schools.

pupils, when their minds are unbent and their spirits free as air, during the relaxation which follows the school-room occupations.\*

If our suggestions on these particulars should gain any attention, we should of course expect that some of the plans proposed would be tried by way of experiment, rather than the whole of them be brought into operation at once, but if all were tried in the course of the next year, the experience which has been gained in the management of the school-room grants justifies us in stating that there need be no additional expense at public offices, on account of the work. It would be performed by the voluntary Societies, as in the case referred to; and the whole of the grants for the six different plans, (including the usual 20,000*l.* for the school-rooms,) need not exceed sixty thousand pounds.

\* See Third Report of Glasgow Society, quoted before.

NOTE.—Since the preceding article was written, the Bishop of London has published a sermon preached on behalf of the National Society, in compliance with the Queen's Letter. Those who know his lordship's happy style of exposition, the clearness of diction, and the singleness and unity of purpose for which his sermons are remarkable, will at once form an idea of the value of his testimony at the present moment, grounded and supported throughout by the text, "*Wisdom is a defence, and money is a defence, but the excellency of knowledge is, that wisdom giveth life to them that find it.*" We refer to this publication because we conceive that it affords general and unqualified support to the arguments which it has been our business to set forth. There is a preface to the sermon of much value, in which his lordship renews "the protest he had already made, as a member of the legislature, against all attempts to introduce in this country a system of general education, which excludes, or omits, all direct instruction in the Bible." The protest against the Central Education Society, "which argues for the exclusion of religion from the regular intellectual instruction of schools," is repeated, and the charges against that institution are substantiated. His lordship is of opinion, and, we think, proves the point, that "neither the Central Society, nor the government itself, were it disposed to make the attempt, (which he does not believe to be the case,) could succeed in forcing upon the people of this country such an education as the former (Central Society) contemplates." He goes further and says, what we believe to be most true, "that no system of education can be forced upon the people at large, which shall not be in conformity with the principles of the Church of England, and work by its instrumentality. *It will be our own fault if it be otherwise!*" The example of Holland, as favouring, to a certain extent, the views of the Central Education Society, is considered at some length, with other important matters, and we are happy to find that one of the plans we have enumerated (No. 2, p. 372) has his lordship's countenance and is likely to be carried into effect. "I entirely agree (his lordship writes) with Mr. Horner, (the translator of M. Cousin's work on Holland,) in thinking that an effort should be made to establish schools of a better sort; not merely however for the children of the working classes as we commonly understand the expression, but for the class next above them, the little tradesmen and artisans, for whose children a good and useful education, comprising sound religious instruction, might be provided at as small a price as that which they now pay for the worst possible kind of tuition. I have long been desirous of seeing this effort systematically made, and I now rejoice in the certainty of its being made, either by the National Society or by some kindred association acting upon the same principles."

---

- ART. IV.—1. *The Study of Morals vindicated and recommended, in a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, February 5, 1837.* By Henry Arthur Woodgate, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College.
2. *The Law of the Mind and the Law of the Members, a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on St. Peter's Day, 1837, with Notes and an Appendix. Wherein the Existence of an innate Moral Faculty is maintained, and some Observations are offered on Mr. Woodgate's late Sermon.* By Charles Henry Craufurd, M.A. Rector of Old Swinford, Worcestershire, and Chaplain to the Marquis of Londonderry.
3. *On the Foundations of Morals. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, November, 1837.* By the Rev. William Whewell, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.
4. *The Dangers and Safeguards of Ethical Science, the Inaugural Lecture of the Rev. W. Sewell, M.A. Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford, and Sub-Rector of Exeter College.*
5. *Remarks upon the Aristotelian and Platonic Ethics, as a branch of the Studies pursued in the University of Oxford.* By the Rev. Frederick Oakeley, M.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

GREAT discoveries are not to be expected in moral philosophy. We can never be masters of its propositions as we are of those in mathematics and physics. For its objects are external to our understandings, and have a reality independent of, and co-ordinate with, or anterior to our own. The forms to which we refer material objects, when we are said to explain or understand their relations, are purely intellectual, and comprehended by our intellect. When they are once defined, we possess the means of deducing from them innumerable relations expressed in terms of space and time, and that with a certainty which we cannot question. But it is impossible to define any single object of moral philosophy without introducing some term, whose meaning we do not thus comprehend. Nor can our apprehension of the meaning of such terms be secured from error by mere instruction or attention, as it requires a certain state of the habits and affections, and presupposes acts and feelings.

Hence the existence of manifold errors in moral philosophy is no proof that the subject has not been in the main satisfactorily treated, any more than mistaken notions about the sun, held by Hottentots or Esquimaux, are a proof that the outlines of the

solar system were not correctly drawn by Newton, or filled up by La Place. Indeed it would rather be a phenomenon craving solution, if we saw the Church, the great organ of moral education, so crippled, and so limited in her operations as she is, and yet no growth of false systems arising from the undirected workings of human intellect, invited to high thoughts by her presence, but not duly aided by her guiding hand.

Those fundamental notions, which Mr. Whewell so well describes as being essential to the progress of physical science, are capable of being fixed and defined in terms purely intellectual, and the apprehension of these requires a certain intellectual education and exercise. But those of the science of Man can only be apprehended by Man educated as in his true spiritual state, and in the experience of his true spiritual relations.

Error may indeed often be demolished by the exposure of its inconsistency, but that process is not enough to supply its place with truth. And in such subject-matter as that of morals, the scattered fragments of an erroneous system are apt only to fall back upon a new centre, somewhat more remote than before, and assume again the appearance of a system capable of similar demolition and reconstruction.

Such is eminently the case with Utilitarianism, a system built on the negation of any real centre of our moral perceptions, and supposed proved when they are so ranged round an imaginary centre, that no inconsistency remains in sight. To every one who is not satisfied to build his system on its own baselessness, the primary negation of any absolute good prior to pleasureable sensation, is the one great inconsistency which disproves the whole. But that granted, the parts gravitate no-whither, and admit of endless refinement of adaptation.

But when the main principles of the science are assumed, and the truths of Revelation which exhibit them in life are believed, men are still liable to inaccuracies of thought, and are allured on all sides by systems professing to give the mind a mastery of this science, the notion of which is as flattering to pride as it is repugnant to reason.

The danger of these is obviated partly by the exposure of error, partly by the effects of discipline, partly by the right use of authority, and partly by the striking out of such lines of thought as may exhibit in a true order and coherency those objects which for the time being mainly engross the attention of thinking men.

Bishop Butler's Analogy and Sermons are an excellent specimen of this last. The balance of the faculties, and what deter-

mines the nature of the individual mind, was the subject of the problems of his day. And he has shown the relation of those problems, for instance, of the question of liberty and necessity to religion and to moral philosophy, with a clearness most useful to any one who is perplexed in the inquiry. The problems of this day relate more to society and to education, and while the revival of doctrine and practice relating to the Church is necessary to supply the foundation for a right scheme on which they may be solved, a philosophical inquiry into the relations which we bear to the Church is necessary for the superstructure.

Mr. Woodgate's Sermon contains excellent remarks on this subject, though not intended as a full discussion of it. Indeed the limits of a single sermon do not allow of any thing like a complete statement of what ought to be said on the points of which he has treated, much less on those which he has touched upon. Besides, it is very difficult to enter thoroughly into the exact meaning which an author attaches to each term, when so little is set before us at once. For although it would be annihilating not only science but reason, to suppose that there is no such thing as *the right* nomenclature in moral philosophy, and that therefore every writer may make one for himself, or all may acquiesce in one that is arbitrary; yet it would be too much to expect any one man to have full possession of the correct use of words.

Two men, who hold the very same opinions, might yet dispute, for instance, whether Christianity introduces new motives. And that even after the common confusion of thought on this point, the identifying of the motive with the object, has been corrected.

No affection is a motive, till it has an object. Nor indeed can it properly be said to exist till then. We should rather say that the capacity for it, or tendency toward it, exists, and that this, meeting the object, gives rise to the affection. But for this capacity and tendency we want acknowledged terms, as they are generally denoted incorrectly by the name of affection. In one stage of inquiry this inaccuracy may be of small moment, but now it is far otherwise. Now since the tendency is not a motive till it has an object, or, to speak more correctly, does not produce a motive affection till it has an object; it is evident that two different objects may be said to give rise to two different motives, in that the affections are different, or to one only, because the tendency, on which they act, is the same. Again it may be argued that the same tendency is called into action only by the same property in different objects, and that therefore it may be said to give rise to but one affection. And to this it may be replied, that the af-

fection is not towards a mere property, but towards a Being possessed of that property; and farther, that in practice our affections are complex, relating to several properties. The love of God is not the same affection as the love of a father, but a similar affection resulting from the same capacity as related to a higher object. The capacity is not motive where dormant, and when awakened by distinct objects, it takes distinct forms, which may therefore be called distinct motives.

Christianity then presents new objects to the soul, and may, in that sense, be said to call forth new affections, and to introduce new motives, though it be but by acting on tendencies prepared before by less adequate objects, and though the new objects be presented to it by means of the analogies of the old.

The tendency is always according to some idea, which is not the object, but the ground of the communion of the soul with the object. The soul is capable of being in the idea, and the object either is according to the idea, or is capable of being so, and yet is not so, or is incapable of being so at all. Accordingly, the object is approved, disapproved, or disregarded with respect to that idea.

The term idea is here used, not as by Locke, who professedly confounds it with half a dozen other terms, for a notion, but for something which cannot be of itself an object to the mind. Ideas are those forms of being to which we believe that our forms of thought correspond, in which we conceive of things existing, and the partaking of which constitutes their essence. We cannot think of rectitude as an object, though we discern that things right are according to it. We cannot think of equality as an object, though we know that things equal are according to it, and to be according to it is that which constitutes them what they are, equals.

The notion that the desire of right-acting cannot be a motive, arises from some confusion of thought on this subject. It is not the mere name that we desire, but the thing. The tendency toward it is no motive till we have a case before us, but then it is a motive. And though all that is requisite to make an act accord with the idea of rectitude be not at once present to the mind, yet the Stoic may remember that to do this and that is according to right reason in himself, and so be affected by a partial view of its accordance with the idea of rectitude.

The plain moral man may refer an action to the standard of rectitude in his own mind, as a child would refer two eggs to his undefined standard of equality or similarity, and feel its accord-ance. In both these cases, however, the idea cannot be realized

without reference to a supposed superior being, unknown, but whose relation to us is such as to carry with it an overwhelming weight in all questions of right and wrong. Hence, while that being is not truly known, innumerable prejudices hold the place due to right views of things as referred to him.

In like manner the Christian may remember that the like action is according to the relations of things to God, and therefore according to the Divine Wisdom, and so be affected by a view of its accordance with the idea of rectitude, more extensive than he can comprehend. For to man there can be no definition of rectitude really higher than "according to God;" the idea of rectitude being in the Divine Wisdom simple and perfect, together with all other ideas. So that even in the acts of God we can form no higher conception of rectitude than that of accordance with His essential Wisdom. To us, then, it is right to act according to God, and, since His will is according to all His attributes, it is right to act according to His will: which is itself a ground of action capable of supplying a real motive, because we are capable of a real affection in respect of it.

Indeed, what has just been said of the idea, into which the mind enters, must be taken rather as the intellectual theory of what is most perceptibly developed in feeling. It is common now to say that such feeling is the mere result of agreeable and disagreeable impressions of external things. But were it so, it would not stand the tests which are sometimes applied to it. Strong agreeable or disagreeable impressions overcome the mere educational preference of one line of action to another, which results from such causes. But there is no power on earth that can shake the resolution, or change the moral tastes, of a mind used to hold free communion with truly eternal thoughts;—not the metaphysical speculator, who tries in vain to reduce them to palpable forms; but the man who has ever given scope to his feelings in relation to God, and to immortal beings, and fixed them by repeated acts.

A few lines from Mr. Sewell's Inaugural Lecture will best serve to enunciate two important principles, which lie at the foundations of the theory of moral action.

"It is a general law, (which it would be well to bring clearly into light; for its neglect would seem to be the cause of nearly all the mischief now working around us in this age,) that the only objects which can serve as the medium of generating moral power in the human mind are moral beings; and then only when they are contemplated in relation to us, and we to them.

"I will endeavour to state the truth more clearly.



"Every one will allow that we never exert a real control over ourselves—act from internal principles opposed to passive impressions—rise up to the majesty of beings independent of outward influences—in one word, possess or exercise power, except when we follow a duty against an inclination. There is indeed a time when the struggle often repeated is rendered easier and lighter, and virtue at last becomes almost mechanical. But even then it retains the dignity of moral agency from the power previously exerted. All previous action without a struggle is but submission to impression—a passive movement, lifeless as the floating of a boat down a stream, or the whirling of a leaf in the wind.

"But it is also clear that no duty can exist except towards persons. No object in the world binds us, ties us down by a sense of paramount imperative right to one course of action more than another, except mental beings like ourselves, possessed of that internal self-acting power, that *ἀρχὴ πράξεως*, which constitutes personality. God seems to have placed moral beings under a system of mutual gravitation, attraction, and influence, just as he governs the heavenly bodies. Mind acts upon mind, and person impels person. Neither the winds of heaven, nor the earthquake, nor the volcano, seem to affect for a moment the rolling on of the earth in its orbit. But let a comet cross its path, or the sun drop from its centre, or even a distant planet suspend its course, and the earth would feel the shock. And so as we advance into a higher and more etherial region of spiritual existence, material objects cease wholly to affect us; and at no time, even when our feelings are most deeply immersed in the body, do they affect us with a sense of duty, so that a stone, or a plant, or even an inferior animal, should claim over us a single right, or call up an active exertion. All sense of duty of whatever kind is ultimately resolvable into the perception of those relations in which we stand to other beings like ourselves, and into the acknowledgment of certain feelings—and as naturally flowing from such feelings—of certain actions attached to those relations by God in the primary eternal constitution of our nature."—pp. 15—17.

It can be only by a regard to things independent of time and accident, that our views of good and evil can be made independent of time and accident. The hope of an indefinite reward, of a reward consisting in the complete realizing of those very relations, on which we are called to act against the impulses of mere sense and passion, is the nearest thing to that perfect and clear perception of those relations, which makes the agent superior to every thing that is not eternal. But this reward, so far as it is matter of hope, is necessarily not clearly understood. For could we really understand the things of heaven, we were already in possession of them.

Mr. Woodgate has insisted much on this, viz. that the true reward of good moral action, the only reward to which we can look, without lessening the purity of that action, is one which persons

in a low moral state cannot understand. He has shown that this truth was detected by heathen philosophers, and is seen no less in the Christian system.

“Then for sanctions and rewards, ethics promises happiness as a result of right action. Yet it gives not the most remote intimation of what that happiness consists in, and implies, that to do so were impossible. Still it does promise it; and while promising, forbids, by implication, its being sought *as a motive*, except through faith, as it were, in the means which lead to it, and in the promise that it shall so be; showing, from analogy, that it will follow on right action, *if done because* it is right; but that, if sought on its own account, and not through moral principle, it must of necessity fail, not only of being obtained, but of being understood.”—Woodgate, p. 12.

“The time would not allow us now to enter at any length on the second great principle in morals, which is briefly this:—That, as regards the sanctions and the rewards which ethics holds out to its followers, no account whatever can be given of them; they are only to be sought through faith in the means which ethics prescribes for the attainment of them; that if thus sought, they will as surely be obtained, as they will be surely lost, if sought in any other way. We learn from the science, that if we act on principle, the internal happiness which is its reward will follow, (as is satisfactorily shown by Aristotle from analogical reasoning,) assuming the conditions to be fulfilled; but that if sought on its own account, and not through right action, it must assuredly be missed, because each person must form his ideas of happiness and pleasure, from the constitution of his own mind at the time, and from what, at that time, he would most like to possess. So that none but one who was *already* a good man, would form at all a correct notion of it; while to every one else, a description of it, if it could be given, would be distasteful and repulsive.

“Of this important moral fact, there seem to be two causes: first, the *immediate* one, arising out of the nature of the case, by which none but a good man could form an idea of, nor be attracted by, what would make a good man happy. Second, the *final* cause,—to the intent that we should act from the purest motives under the supremacy of conscience, not from the mere hope of reward; the reward not being allowed to possess attractions, save to those prepared for it by a course of previous action, in obedience to the moral sense and the supremacy of conscience.

“I will not now dwell on the adoption of this important principle into the Gospel, as shown in the *undefined* nature of its blessings and rewards, coupled with the reiterated promise, that they will assuredly be found by those who have first served their Lord from ‘the faith which worketh by love.’ The investigation of this principle, as adopted into the Gospel, is a noble subject of contemplation, and one well worthy the attention of the Christian philosopher and student. We must now waive it; but let us mark it, in reference to the utilitarian spirit of the

age. 'Cui bono' is the standard to which every thing, however sacred, is to be referred; but it is following a shadow; it is 'sowing the wind, and reaping the whirlwind.' Reason tells us, through the science of morals, and what is really good and desirable, will never be obtained, nay, not perceived or known, unless first sought, because it is *right*. Reason and philosophy confirm to us the truth of the Scripture declaration, that 'godliness is great gain.' But reason and philosophy also tell us, apart from the logical force of the terms, that the proposition will not bear conversion, save to a Christian.

"With thus far advocating this important principle, the time warns us that, much as remains to be said for rendering to it, and the science generally, the justice it demands, the present consideration of it must be brought to a conclusion. Let it merely be added, as a summary, that, whether by the light of reason or that of revelation, while its own reward is annexed to the full obedience to that light, it is to those only who seek that reward, not for its own sake, but through the medium of duty, and obedience to the light within them. Moralists may dispute, if they will, whether the real or apparent good be the object of man's search. The problem ever was, to identify interest with duty. That problem was solved by the direction of the philosophic Stagirite, to seek first our duty in obedience to the purest light we could attain to; and that, so acting, that light would, far more effectually than any other, conduct us to the possession of our best interests, and surest happiness. That same precept is sanctioned and adopted by the Eternal Son of God, in his injunction, and the analogous promise annexed, when he declares, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it.' And still more in the simple injunction, and the promise which accompanies it; 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things,'—whether the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, or that which supersedes and eclipses them, in the possession of peace with God through Christ, the consolation of the Holy Spirit, and the hope of future glory—in whatever form it may please Him to realise the promise,—the promise will be realised, that 'all these things shall be added to you.'"—*Ibid.* pp. 30—33.

To this and similar statements, Mr. Craufurd has thought it necessary to object. And it is indeed a pity that he has encumbered his sermon (which, with its appendix of authorities, is a valuable popular work on the faculty of discerning right and wrong in actions, when we know what they are) with this controversy; particularly as even the rule of the Church prohibits making the pulpit an arena for dispute. It is indeed in a note, but would have been better omitted altogether. The terms in which he gives an account of the reward, with a view to which a person may begin a course of reformation, are in fact such as a person in that state could but most imperfectly comprehend.

Nor would Christianity itself give an adequate account of his release, but by ascribing it to a Divine Power.

He professes to agree so far as to consider that "moral obligation has nothing whatever to do with the hope of reward, or the fear of punishment;" and yet says that "though the *reason why we are bound* to pursue right conduct, is simply *because it is right*; yet our only *motive* to do so, is the *happiness* which is thus to be obtained." He afterwards says the "desire of happiness," but it is a pity that he has not kept the same accuracy of expression every where. This deficiency helps to conceal both from himself and his readers, the fact, that he is saying nothing intelligible. For indeed he is separating what he urges every one to keep united, happiness and rectitude. The desire of happiness must be actually merged in the desire of rectitude before we can do an action as being right; just as it is in the desire of pleasure before we do an action because it is pleasant. Had we not an immediate affection toward rectitude, capable in itself of being a motive, and able to move us by itself whenever our eye is fixed *singly* on the object of it, the desire of happiness would have no real *state of acting upon rectitude* for its object. And so with all other affections, the desire of happiness has no distinct subsistence after the mind is fixed on the object. The reflection, "How happy am I!" is an uneasy one, and leads us always to aim at a higher happiness, and is the very imperfection of our earthly joy. That is most complete in which self is forgotten, or contemplated but as a casual object.

When we fix our eyes on material objects, no doubt, the contemplation of a rational soul may add dignity to the scene; but when the soul is occupied with the view of heavenly and eternal things, the single self is but a homogeneous particle in the ocean, and is barely, if at all, observed. It is like a string, whose vibrations are rendered more intense and continuous by the surrounding harmony of a chorus, but whose note is less perceived than if it were out of tune.

Self-congratulation were the emptiest of all feelings, if not grounded on something better than itself. And yet, were that complete, we can hardly conceive that there would be much room left for its entertainment. Much less should we have occasion for a calculating exercise of self-love, which looks about for some yet unknown happiness, when it is not kept satisfied by the possession of present good. Our affections are unmeaning, and have no objects at all, unless happiness arises from their having their objects, according to Bishop Butler's statement. To say that the happiness itself is the object, is to say that there is no object at all. The chief office of self-love, or the general desire of hap-

piness, is to act when the mind is unoccupied, and to determine it on attending to this or that impulse. It rejects that which does not promise to occupy and satisfy the soul, or that which is marked with some sign of danger. Self-love must be called in when rectitude is introduced to the notice of a mind unaccustomed to attend to it, and must act so far as to reject whatever would prevent a fair hearing of its claim. And this can be effected by indefinite promises and threats, if believed. Their use is, by extending our views beyond the limits of time to which we have usually confined them, to make us cognizant of things independent of time. In this way those terms, which are commonly applied to earthly things, under the notion that they are really good, are used in the language of inspiration to express things heavenly, from our capacity of possessing which they draw their origin.

But since rectitude is a good wholly independent of time, and is essential to our communion with the supreme and eternal good, we can evidently apprehend but an infinitesimal part of its reality, so long as we are in the habit of contemplating chiefly temporal objects. It is for this reason that we cannot understand the happiness of acting rightly; we see rectitude but in a partial and inadequate way, and our affection towards it has not its complete object. But Mr. Woodgate has nowhere said, what Mr. Craufurd imputes to him, that *no foretaste* of the happiness of acting rightly can be expected at present. Only he thinks it wiser to take high ground at once, and to call on the unhappy votary of pleasure or ambition not to wait and argue over the balance of satisfactions in different ways of acting on his present notions, but to believe those who know true happiness, and to obey the call of conscience at once. It is thus only that he can obtain the full advantage of having about him persons in a state of communion with heaven. Whatever may be said, in condescension to his infirmity, to disprove his vain opinion, if he has it, of the balance of enjoyment in favour of vice, must be only subservient to the exhibition of the truth that he was made for communion with higher objects than he can at present apprehend, and that in the knowledge of them alone he can find his true life. In the mean time no *satisfactory* account of these things can be given, for the experience of right action, as such, is as necessary to awaken us to the idea of rectitude, as is the sight and feeling of objects, to make us conscious of space. Mr. Craufurd shows, indeed, that *some* account can be given of them.

"Escape from the misery of vice," and "enjoyment of the happiness of virtue," are expressions that mean different things to different men; and they have the least meaning to those, who most need the "escape." The perception they have of duty is

much clearer and more certain than their perception of the pleasantness of it. The pleasure comes after the choice, and the same affection, which is the ground of the choice, is the ground of the pleasure too. One who turns from a course of sin chooses a course of duty, a course of right acting which he hopes to continue without end, but without knowing *how* it is to be pleasant to him. Its rectitude is unquestionable, and results inevitably from his relations to God, and to His spiritual creatures. And that it is good in itself, and for him as a rational being, is most evident. But the enjoyment of it belongs but little to its lower degrees; though every step is recompensed with a satisfaction that ought to outweigh all that vice can offer, because it is of a higher order. But this comparison, or rather impossibility of comparison, is not so familiar to one, whose senses are not exercised to discern good and evil, but that he often dreams of some wrong course as that of pleasure. Are we to say that he never does this without again declining into it? Is it not a direct apprehension of the Divine Majesty which he would offend, or the Divine Love which he would outrage, that restrains him, rather than any reflection upon immediate or consequent pleasure or pain? If our affections do not rest in their objects as their ends, but in a pleasure or pain connected with them, they have no objects at all. It may be true of sensual inclinations, because in them, indeed, our affections, the actings of our rational souls, have no real objects. But of our higher and spiritual affections it is false; they are founded on real relations, as being real.

The word "happiness" may, indeed, be used in a sense higher than that of pleasure, viz. for the possession of real good. But even in this view, it is not the possession on which we reflect, but the good which we contemplate, that is the ground of our affection. For a spiritual being has no need to seek for relations to anything that is; whatever is, is to him; whatever is good, is good to him. No saying of Aristotle gives us so high a notion of his attainments as this, "That a good man is a good to another good man, as he is to himself." To have conceived such a thought is immortal honour to a heathen. To realize it thoroughly is far from being the first step in the Christian life. It is only after repeated exercise and experience that such truths can be drawn out and reflected on, though, no doubt, they are felt from the first in some degree.

Of course, it will be objected, that such views of absolute good and rectitude carry us into a world of abstractions, out of the line of common feelings, and common duties. But this objection only arises from the necessity of sometimes calling common things by uncommon names in philosophical inquiries.

We are surrounded by *men*. And if we learn to regard them as being what they really are, we shall have no occasion to search for feelings more refined, or relations more obligatory, than those which we bear to them. For they, as we, are not mere isolated individuals, but "members in particular" of one Body, comprehending ourselves, and forming what may be called a Person, to whom we owe more than our utmost efforts can pay, one, whose outward acts we can see, one, whom our outward acts can affect, and yet, one who has a mysterious relation to the Deity.

The steps by which we rise to the contemplation of this Person, and the use of all in adapting us to the highest state of which we can form a conception, are admirably illustrated by Mr. Sewell; a few words must be quoted from a long and most eloquent passage on this subject.

"But it is not so obvious—it seems in the present day to be almost forgotten—that there are two descriptions of persons, each possessing a right over our actions, each imperatively requiring from us the due fulfilment of those relations in which nature and God have placed us to them.

"There are individual persons—and there are persons made up of societies. Any body of men speaking by one voice, and acting as a community, is as capable, in the eye of a moralist, of possessing moral rights, and of claiming moral duties, as it is in the eyes of the jurist of inheriting property, or of exercising a trust. It may stand to us in relations as clearly seen, and as strictly binding as any individual.

"The relation of brotherhood, consanguinity, beneficence, instruction, protection, even something more than a moral parentage, may all be enjoyed and fulfilled by bodies of men just as they are by us separately."

—p. 38.

"And the deduction which I would draw is this; and if we do find ourselves placed in connection with any body, exercising to us the duties of the closest and tenderest and noblest relation of human nature—if on it depend the right fulfilment of all other relations of social life—if the moral authority of this body, attested by all the acknowledged evidences of mental greatness, is superior to that of any other society, and, much more, to that of any individual upon earth, then our duty to that body is paramount to all other earthly duties, and all our speculations, like all our actions, should be placed under its control, and subordinated to the furtherance of its views."—p. 41.

It is truly gratifying to see the coincidence of this, in direction at least, with the somewhat different, but parallel line of Mr. Woodgate's inquiry. And another work has lately appeared, which promises that Cambridge will do her part in prosecuting the same great plan of investigation. Mr. Whewell's *Four Sermons on the Foundations of Morals*, are a valuable testimony

to the same great truths which are insisted on by the other writers of whom we have spoken. And he, as well as they, may contribute, we might say has contributed, towards the formation of a consistent and received body of moral philosophy, deduced from sound principles. His proposed edition of a part of Butler's works, exhibited as a system, may be of use to many minds, particularly to those who are not familiar with the systematic treatise of Aristotle, in which the main principles are the very same which he and his Oxford contemporaries propose to work out. The subjugation of the inferior faculties to the superior,—of the whole man to conscience, *i. e.* to God, is the principle which he assumes as the basis of a system of ethics. And it is this, in one form or other, which has been involved in all systems hitherto, so far as they have been true. And Mr. Oakeley's remarks have shown how well the system of Aristotle will bear adaptation to the acknowledgment of higher relations than he knew, and how he seems tacitly to refer to an unknown God. But it must be remembered, that the one principle just mentioned, will give rise only to general rules, which cannot be applied to particulars without a knowledge of the constitution of things in those mysterious points which connect the material with the spiritual world. The relations to superior, equal, and inferior beings, insisted on by Mr. Sewell, the three "friendships" of Aristotle, which are real spiritual relations, very visibly embodied in many cases, will carry us to a considerable length in this investigation. But the manner in which the New Testament refers to the original constitution of things, as a ground of practice, seems to indicate something, which, in our present state, we shall hardly fathom. Indeed, the very notion of determining questions relating to sensible objects, by a reference to unseen and spiritual relations, implies some scale of interpretation, by which the one may be expressed in terms of the other.

It is common to say, indeed, that all our terms for expressing spiritual things are derived from those which express natural objects; and that all our knowledge of the former is derived from the analogy of the latter. But this is only true in the same sense as it is true that we derive the notion of a cause from experience. Experience would never convey to us the notion of a cause, by the repetition of uniform sequence, whether of external events one on another, or of events external or internal on our volition, had we not an innate tendency to conceive of these things according to the idea of causation. No more would acts of government convey to us the idea of authority (to be obeyed for *conscience* sake), but that we are so constituted as to appre-



hend the spiritual reality of the will of God, conveyed to our understanding by means of subordinate agents.

When, therefore, words, which are commonly used to express physical relations, are applied to higher subjects, it is always with the condition, that the thing understood by them is not the external object or fact, but the spiritual one, which we discern as embodied in it. And as, even in natural philosophy, there must always be a causation apprehended which is beyond the reach of explanation, and ultimate; so, and much more, in moral philosophy, there must always be a mysterious link between the seen and the unseen, which it is the province of faith to maintain. Perhaps it should rather be said, that here the province of philosophy ends; that true philosophy submits to her guide, when once found, implicitly.

Without the Church, or where her presence is not felt, there must ever be a great mass of possible actions, which are, as far as any known principle is concerned, indifferent. These may either be set aside by the killing sternness of stoicism, left undisciplined by an epicurean licentiousness, held in doubt by an academic liberality, or arranged by imaginary principle, or utilitarian calculation.

But within her precincts, if men indeed know where they are, they find few actions that can be called indifferent. This is the case to some extent in every vigorous polity. External acts take their meaning from the manner in which man is accustomed to act upon man, and are approved or disapproved according to the real acts which they denote and convey. But, in that polity which is based on the true constitution of man, which unites him with his real origin, which extends to his eternal state, which is capable of embracing his whole species, and in which alone he can have his true life, the whole range of his faculties and capacities have their due scope and exercise. Fixed on their proper objects, his desires no longer need the constraint of mere law, which was a provisional approximation to the decision of true wisdom, and in a lower state, most needful to his advancement. And this, perhaps, is the reason why philosophy cannot accurately fix the boundaries of law. Law is from above, if true, and draws rather than heaves men upwards. The calculations, or other ground-works that man would supply, are of subsequent invention, law was never derived from them. Human law may be modified by them, but to suppose them the ground of obligation is to deny that there is any such thing as obligation.

And though law is not the principle of life, yet, even under the Gospel, it is the guard and fence of that principle. Acknowledged law gives us notice when we are declining from the right

path, and is useful to us as a check, to which we submit when we find that we are not steadily pursuing it. It has not the rule of our heritage, yet is it of great authority over us, as those who are not yet of full age, nor entered into complete possession.

And we must look rather to the prevalence of good feeling and obedience, grounded on the knowledge of our highest relations, for the attainment of a state in which all actions will take their due place, than to the advancement of philosophical speculation. It is indeed dangerous to affect to find all that is put forth as new in ancient authors; but this is a safer side to err on, than that of making all philosophy and all religion rest on the last novelty, or even supposing that the last discoverer has surpassed all former inquirers. The intellectual triumph of making a discovery is not a thing to which a Christian, who realizes his position, thinks it worth his while to aspire. He values the truth because of itself, or rather because of its relation to the source of all truth, and not as a mere instrument for the display of his own powers. Thus thinking, he can take a dispassionate view of the question of originality, so meanly contested among the philosophers of the world. He is not unwilling to acknowledge that his own views coincide even with those of heathen sages, as far as their field of vision extended. And when he ranges beyond the thoughts of his fellows, in moral philosophy at least, he does not pretend to do more than give a distinct expression for truths which are present to every good man's conscience. A common man's view is like the picture of a landscape in the eye; a philosophical system is the description, and the principal objects are as much in the eye of the beholder as of the describer.

The doctrine of the supremacy of the intellect would at once place the moral philosopher at the head of mankind. Such may not be his place, and yet he must hold a high station if he is to attain any thing like true philosophy. And since all men are to a certain extent moral philosophers, and use language which has its correct meaning only in the mouth of a philosopher, it is most important that this study should be so cultivated, that right notions may prevail with respect to its leading objects. This cannot be unless men's minds are conformed to the ideas of them by other means. But it will also promote the same end if a sufficient sprinkling of men, possessed of a correct nomenclature and accurate theory, are scattered over the face of society.

To effect this is one of the important duties which belong to our Universities, and there is good reason to hope that they will continue to perform this duty with increasing efficiency. The authors whom we have quoted are evidently men well fitted to hold such

a trust in their hands, even in a period of intellectual excitement and activity like the present. They appreciate and adopt with discrimination what has been already done, and points which are touched on in the writings of Aristotle and Plato, as they appear in common life, expand under their hands, and are developed as fertile germs of thought. The sternness of their principles has indeed alarmed a considerate and generally well-judging writer, lest our youth should be led to shrink from so severe an aspect of virtue. But the strength of their character, and the truth and force of their statements, must at least benefit those who are disposed to receive a sound and practical philosophy. As for the profligate, neither philosophy nor religion itself viewed by the mere intellect, can show them any thing pleasant *to them* in goodness. And when they do awake, by what means soever it may be, it is not things said about pleasantness or unpleasantness, but the great objects presented to their attention, that will occupy their thoughts and determine their purposes.

The system, which is thriving under the culture of these able and earnest men, is not to be called that of any particular school. It is the common ground of Aristotle and Plato, and cannot be wholly deserted without the admission of some monstrous falsehood. Even Utilitarians, for instance, must assume that we know whether an action is right or wrong, when we know what it is, though they escape into falsehood by the assumption, that to act is to produce pleasure or pain, *and nothing else*. Thus they are able to assert, that since it is right to act so as to produce pleasure, all actions are good or evil according to the pleasure or pain they will produce. What they think of acts relating immediately to God, whether that they are to be measured solely by the pleasure they will produce to the agent, is for themselves to say. It is true that all actions produce pleasure or pain, but that they do nothing else were a bold assertion.

The true philosophy ventures on no such assumptions. Its assertors may sometimes unguardedly utter negations of all that is not comprehended in some individual theory, but they are sure to contradict them when they bear on any important point. And it is better for a man to contradict himself, than to persevere in contradicting the truth. They feel their way among doubts and shadows by their hold on deep and solid truth; and this has ever been the line marked out for men by the divine dispensations. The patriarchs were approved for preferring the scattered glimpses of divine truth to the dictates of temporal calculation, nay, of natural feeling and instinct. The Jews were expected to rest on their belief of the moral attributes of God, and to see His character in the shadows of the law, and to judge between

apparently conflicting duties in a spirit of faith. And the heathen philosophers had to find the grounds of virtue, and the notions of a supreme Being, in things unseen, and little tangible, obscured by fable and the ill practice of the world. And if we have more light, we have more to view by it, and must not pretend to see otherwise than "as by a glass, darkly," when we look at things above us, nor to see clearly on earth by any other light than what is shed on it from them. That in earthly things which we see by heavenly light, is itself heavenly, as the act of the body is the act of the man, and whatever in it is of reason, is seen by reason.

Error will have its day. Eternal truth itself may give life to forms, that die away from it as the body from the soul. But the main elements of sound philosophy are imperishable, and the possession of them will ever be the inheritance of earnest, humble, conscientious inquirers. They have been ever the inheritance of the Church, and they will not fail to be acknowledged where the Church is faithful and vigorous.

It is, perhaps, rather falling back on what we have stated before, but it cannot be much out of place to quote, to this purpose, a few remarks by Mr. Oakeley.

"Strikingly at variance, again, with many views of the present day, is that system of philosophy, which perpetually distinguishes between the good, and the apparent good; between opinion (what *seems* to men) and truth (what *is*). Plato was, of course, the philosopher who was led, in opposing the sceptical philosophy of his time, to protest with most earnestness against the system which substitutes, for divine and eternal truth, the fluctuating standard of human opinion. But Aristotle, although characteristically (*in contradistinction to Plato*) the philosopher of *experience*, never loses sight of the unchangeable nature of truth, moral as well as intellectual. He admits, indeed, the general opinion of men as an *evidence*, but never bows to it as a *law*. It is always, with him, a *reason for inquiry*; it may amount even to a *ground of presumption*; but it is never more. It is characteristically the standard of *rhetoric*, as contradistinguished from *ethics*; i. e. of the philosophy of *shewy*, rather than *intrinsic*, virtue. If, however, such consent can be proved not *general* only, but *universal*, it amounts to a *testimony* of highest value. There is, again, the *judgment of the best men*. This becomes even a *standard* of ethics; a kind of personification of abstract moral truth. For, what these men think (it must be remembered) is not right, *because they think it*, but rather they think it *because it is right*. Aristotle has, in this instance, admirably distinguished between general opinion, universal consent, authority, and truth, as beyond all. To us, who at once believe in the corruption of the human intellect, and of the human heart, and who enjoy the privilege of an inspired guide, mere general opinion becomes hardly so much as a ground of presumption. Yet we attribute much to the argument from universal consent. On

the other hand, truth and authority are often coincident. Even Aristotle saw, that something more than mere intellect is required towards authority in practical subjects; and the doctrine of spiritual influence, not merely *inspiring* (in the strict sense of the term) 'holy men of old,' but promised to the Church, and accorded to the prayer of individuals, goes towards approximating, almost even to identity, abstract and embodied truth."—p. 32—34.

His remarks in general give a very just view of the elements of truth, on which the philosophy of Aristotle was founded. There is also a masterly sketch of some of the great problems of the ancient moral philosophy, and of their solution in Christianity, in one of the late pamphlets on the question of subscribing the Articles, entitled "Subscription no Bondage." It is there shown that the ancient philosophy always pointed to a universal polity, as essential to the true life of man, to his being in act what he is in essence. And so far as this was felt, even though not intellectually acknowledged, men acted as not "born for themselves," but as spiritual beings related to spiritual beings. A man who knew enough to state the truth, however vaguely, was heard with wonder and delight, and if it was but a lovely song to the many, there were always those who obeyed the law written in their hearts, and maintained its dictates in outward form wherever they could distinguish them. These were always so far clear that the intellectual activity of Greece could not avoid meeting and acknowledging their leading features, while afterwards have in vain attempted, and will in vain attempt, to reduce them to forms entirely comprehensible. But they may be applied to wider and wider fields of history, to higher and higher relations of life, till the old seems but the picture and type of the new. They may be from time to time examined till the philosopher sees the greatness of the truth contained in them in its extension to man in every state, powerful to the simplest peasant as well as to himself; and wonders more at the unfolding view of man as related to God, than the humble and plodding student wonders at his own clouded, though dazzling conception, of a transcendent intellect.

On the use of moral philosophy to ourselves Mr. Woodgate has said much, as indeed it is the proper object of his sermon. Amongst other instances of the application of its results, he introduces the following observations, which deserve well to be more fully developed.

"Take next some of the most important principles now questioned and misunderstood, and see how completely their defence is provided by an acquaintance with the science of morals. We may pass by the adaptation of revelation itself to the moral constitution of man. Take

a subject which follows next in importance, and which has not been investigated ; but which is connected, more or less, with all the subjects at issue between us and our assailants—the adaptation of the Church to the moral constitution of man. It is obvious to any casual observer, that all the attacks made upon us and our system, involve the discussion, modified in a greater or less degree, of what may be termed the Catholic principle, as opposed to the rationalistic, self-trusting, free-thinking, spirit of the age. Not to dwell too long, let us assume the chief features of the Catholic or Church principle to be, that to the disciple, things are to be taken first on trust, on the authority of others, with the promise that, in time, he will understand the truth himself, or (which comes in *practice* to the same point,) be *satisfied* with it ; but that, at commencing, a bias or prejudice (let us adopt that much-abused word) is absolutely necessary for the mere perception of truth ; that he must be brought up to think in this particular way, trained to it from infancy, if possible ; that his mind must be prejudiced in favour of doctrines ; and that then, and not before, Scripture is to be put into his hands, in order that, as St. Luke tells his disciple, he may then ‘know the certainty of those things in which he has been instructed.’ This is the leading principle of the Apostolic Church, (as distinguished from its doctrines,) and is embodied in all its institutions and provisions ; in its infant baptism, and the sacred bias implied in the mere notion of regeneration, and the consequent call for early instruction to retain that bias, and the provision made for this, in the catechism, and creeds, and formularies ; further enforced in the exhortation directed to be given to the sponsors.

“Now, how completely does all this accord with the first great principle in the science of morals, alluded to before, by which moral perceptions presuppose an early bias, and the necessity of being brought up so to think and believe. So that, however bigoted the Church principle may be deemed by some ; however they may stigmatize it as calculated to enslave the human mind, it is at least in accordance with the suggestions of human reason, and the principles of the soundest philosophy. It is no more than might have been expected *à priori*, not only on the assumption that the Author of Nature was also the Author of Revelation ; but also on the assumption, that that Author had designed to infuse the healing leaven of that revelation into the mass of human sinfulness, by instruments best adapted to the moral constitution of the recipient.”—p. 24—26.

The superintendence of the Church has been most eloquently and powerfully insisted on, as the great safeguard of the study of moral philosophy, by Mr. Sewell in his Inaugural Lecture. But the Aristotelian side of this important subject still requires the discriminating logic of Mr. Woodgate. It will be his office, to judge by his Bampton Lectures, now in the course of delivery, to mark definite points for the intellect, where other voyagers have touched on and reported of this vast continent of truth. Their sketches and specimens are more than tempting, but they

have scarcely aimed at exactness of description and hydrography. And should any reader, unaccustomed to the schools, fancy them at times to be cold where warmth is due to the interest of the subject, let him remember that he is not always the warmest friend who talks most of friendship and of feelings. The man who does a hard service heartily, with an air of business, and his whole soul for the time seeming to be in his fingers' ends, or who "throws cold water" upon some cherished scheme of folly, has a hidden reserve of friendship which is discerned by the keen observer in its effects. So it is with the writers who have entered on labours of deep research for the benefit of the Church. Even Hooker has been thought cold, because he is calm and busy at his work; and Butler is often set aside as a "mere moralist:" yet it would not be easy to find writers who show a greater degree of real interest in sacred truth. Take, for instance, Butler's Sermon on the Love of God, in which he undertakes the strange task of gravely arguing that it is reasonable to love God, and performs it without one slip of irreverence, or one flaw of sophistry. How can this be? After one reading one might say, "From the clearness of his mind"—but on a second reading the real cause would appear, a deep-seated reverence and love that were fixed on the Great Theme of the discourse, and knew instinctively how to bear themselves in His presence.

But, indeed, as there is nothing colder than sophistry, so there is nothing that more truly shows a man to be interested in any matter, than his setting himself earnestly to work to examine the real reasons and facts relating to it.

Moral science is not recommended as the remedy for human depravity, but as something useful towards the application of the remedy. It might, indeed, be studied on lower grounds, as a part of the system of humanity to which that remedy is applicable. But, like all other things, when healed by the influence of divine truth, it takes a place which is truly its own, and in which it can work for the glory of God and the good of man. As it served before to detect the contradictions which are involved in the existence of a rational creature ignorant of his Creator, a fallen and redeemed creature ignorant of his Redeemer, a creature capable of holiness, but ignorant of his Sanctifier, and in a system whose every part bears undeniable testimony to original and omnipotent goodness, and to the existence of present evil; so, when revelation has supplied the knowledge of man's real constitution and relations, it serves to aid us in apprehending and in working out the restored harmony of creation. Not, indeed, that it was from the first independent of revelation, for the remnants of patriarchal knowledge were necessary to raise mankind

above a mere material life, and to open their minds to the great questions involved in the very names of right and wrong.

The consideration of the various means, adapted to various conditions, by which men are raised step by step towards the direct apprehension of divine things, is most delightful and instructive. It is in the Christian Church that they are seen in their full and combined operation, but the relations of the state, and the yet more universal relations of the family, have each their office in this work.

We shall never be able to possess ourselves of the fields of moral science, and to command the fruits of all the various and successive conquests that have been made in them, while we are surrounded by unrecognized realities. To study the ethical theory of politics, without knowing that there is such a thing as the City of God, is but a vain attempt. What has been written on that subject must raise in the mind a thousand questions, the answers to which can only be found in facts relating to the Church. And the knowledge of those facts, and of their true import, will carry an inquirer safely through a wilderness of notions, in which he would be utterly lost without it. He will have a centre to which his whole system can be referred, a practical bearing for every result, as well as a guide in every difficulty.

ART. V.—1. *Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah.* (Intended to complete the Works of Shuckford and Prideaux.) By the Rev. Michael Russell, D.D. Vol. III. 8vo. 1837. London: Rivingtons.

2. *Histoire des Juifs dans le Moyen Age.* (Depping.) Paris: Treuttel et Wurtz. 1 vol. 8vo. 1833.

THERE *did* exist a period when what was called "The Philosophy of History" substituted a lively and playful scepticism, and a spirited and agreeable trifling, for the study and critical examination of facts. It treated as mere fables the antiquities of Asia. It turned into ridicule the pomp of Babylon, the grandeur of Nineveh, and the riches of Susa, and set them aside as stories unworthy of belief, or even of attention. It altogether discarded the Bible and Herodotus; and, withdrawing Egypt and Asia from the calendar of the human race, reduced what it condescended to preserve of history, to a mere gallery of pictures, or a succession of spirited epigrams.



But, at the very time when the disciples of Voltaire—(in imitation of the high-priest of their school, who, in his ignorance concerning the theory of the earth, had launched out his sarcasms against those learned scholars whose ardour in the dawning science of geology had led them to explore the tops of mountains in search of shells,)—at the very time, we repeat it, when this jeering and sceptical school was making a mockery of science and a sport of history, wise men and travellers, thirsting for information, and full of perseverance and good faith, were advancing by different paths to the investigation of the truths of antiquity, and were laying the foundation of that knowledge which was afterwards to lead to greater and more brilliant discoveries. Niebuhr, who had studied in the school of Michaelis, traversed Egypt, Arabia\* and Persia, discovered the site of Nineveh, carried his researches to the ruins of Babylon, copied the inscriptions, and made designs from the antiquities of Persepolis. Anquetil Duperron, who had already made himself familiar with the Asiatic languages, published, under the title of *Zend-Avesta*, a collection of the sacred writings of the Parsees, and thus furnished the learned portion of Europe with a key to those mysterious dialects, and ancient forms of religious worship, of which all traces were supposed to have been lost.† Since that era, however, but especially since the commencement of the present century, a multitude of travellers and learned men, following in the steps of their great predecessors, have explored the East, ransacked Asia in all directions, brought to light a large store of valuable materials, and are still daily labouring to elucidate the hieroglyphics and throw light upon the monuments of those countries. We could not enumerate all who have laboured in this department of investigation without incurring the risk of wearying the memory of our readers. Suffice it to say, that the result of this continued research has been to re-establish, in every point of view, the authority of the ancient traditions, and to render the testimony of former ages almost like so many new discoveries. The names of the Pharaohs, found upon the Egyptian monuments by Young, Sylvestre de Sacy, Champollion, and others, have fully confirmed the reputation of Manetho's writings on the chronology of Egypt. The numerous monuments found in Assyria have furnished us with matter which tends to justify, on many points, the much-disputed assertions of Sanchoniatho and Berosus. The Phœnician alphabet is almost entirely made out ;

\* Description de l'Arabie d'après les Observations faites dans le Pays même, in 4to, Copenhagen, 1772 : avec cartes et figs. Voyage en Arabie et d'autres Pays circonvoisins, 1774—1778 : 2 vols. in 4to. : avec cartes et figs. Copenhagen.

† The Works of Zoroaster, 3 vols. in 4to.

and there are now only wanting some few monuments (and which may possibly be found amongst the ruins of Carthage\*) to complete our information regarding the language and religion of this people. The cuneiform writing, inscribed on the bricks of Babylon, as well as on the rocks of Persepolis, and discovered more recently in Armenia, on the mountains in the vicinity of the town of Van† (a city built by Semiramis), long continued to be objects of perplexity and wonder to antiquaries. They have, however, begun to lose some portion of their mysterious character, since Dr. Grotefend and the learned and unfortunate St. Martin‡ succeeded in deciphering the names of several Persian sovereigns; and we are entitled to hope that owing to the persevering efforts and combined talents of Schulz, Schlegel, Lassen, Bopp, Burnouf, and other erudite men, who, full of zeal and ardour, have followed in the same track, the last veil will be stripped off from this sacred and ancient language, and we shall finally become acquainted with its full scope and import. Who could have foreseen that from the depths of the Etruscan tombs, in the Campagna of Rome, a crowd of revelations would have been brought to light, and the past genius of the ancient world be exhibited to our view?

By these monuments we learn that the civilization of Etruria, of Greece, and of Upper Asia, were connected together by a similarity of religious forms and observances, of which the graphic representations are the symbols; and these precious relics themselves confirm the venerable traditions of antiquity.

The human race, in its regular and majestic course, has gradually unfolded its powers, and at each successive period of its advance has added to its stores the ideas and information derived from the labours of preceding generations. At every stage of its progress, and from every quarter, it has availed itself of the discoveries of by-gone ages. Thus, in the ancient territory of the east, Egypt, India, Chaldea, Phœnicia, and Persia, have more or less been influenced by one another, each according to its capacity, its resources and its genius; and from similar causes the same influences have extended themselves over Asia, Greece, Etruria, and Rome, according as time and circumstances, and the state of manners and languages, have been more or less favourable. Our efforts therefore should be directed to concentrate

\* "*Recherches sur l'Emplacement de Carthage*," by C. T. Falbe, Consul-General of Denmark. Paris. Imprimerie Royale.

† The late Dr. Schulz discovered, in 1827, in the environs of Van, forty-two inscriptions in cuneiform characters, containing indubitable monuments of high Assyrian antiquity, which have been carefully published by the Asiatic Society at Paris.

‡ "*Mémoires sur l'Arménie*," tom. i. p. 13, et suivantes.

into one focus the labours of the preceding races of mankind, as far as our present knowledge will admit, by combining science with tradition; and this is the goal to which, by a simultaneous effort, all our studies should tend, in geology, archæology, philology, numismatics, &c. Thus also, historical truth, so lightly treated by the false and frivolous philosophy of the last century, will become more and more settled and consolidated upon the sound basis of literature and scientific research. In the first place, we have the Bible, which, independently of its sacred character, contains the most magnificent collection of original records ever possessed by any nation from its commencement until the period of its dismemberment and final dispersion. The Bible has again become for us what it should never have ceased to have been—the records where there is the most to study, and in which we shall find every day more and more to learn, in proportion as we acquire fresh knowledge from other sources. It is to the Bible that we must look, as to the highest source of historical facts and the *ultima ratio* of all our reasonings. The book of Genesis gives us a description of the creation, upon which God himself has set his seal. Cuvier, the two Herschels, Sacy, Buckland, Ampère, Greenough, and Humboldt have sufficiently proved by their deep researches the accordance of science with faith, respecting the original formation and the component parts of the universe. Is not the world's age engraven on the barks of trees, in the bowels of the earth, and in the planetary system, as well as written in the customs and traditions of mankind? Observe how, in the first chapter of the sacred book, all the natural sciences are developed in their order and progress. The unformed materials rise out of chaos; a vegetable life is bestowed upon herbs and plants; animals breathe and move; man lives and reasons. Thus the work of God is continually advancing throughout creation, and vitality flows with greater intensity in proportion as it approaches mankind.

Cosmography and anthropology are the pivots on which natural history revolves. The origin of the different races of men, their dispersion after the Deluge, and the statistical account of their migrations, perfectly accord with the most probable deductions to be derived from the biblical tradition. The Hebrew books contain a fund of materials, of which, in our opinion, history has not as yet fully availed itself. The books of the prophets abound with allusions of the highest interest, and with direct testimony, of still greater value, to the antiquities of Upper Asia. Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, and the curious and instructive letter which is to be found at the end of the book of Baruch,

throw important light on the monuments of this cradle of the world. But it is from the book of Daniel that we obtain the most important information. Daniel was himself brought up in the science of the Magi; he resided at Babylon, and died at Susa.

We regret that our limits oblige us to be brief in our introductory remarks; and in order to be economical of the space allotted us, we shall at once proceed in our endeavours to prove, with Dr. Russell, (who has just completed his portion of the series by the publication of the volumes which we have placed at the head of this article,) first, That the Israelites, being more addicted to agriculture and literature,\* than to commerce or to the arts of industry, were in these latter occupations inferior to the Phœnicians: secondly, That the dispersion of the Jews throughout the globe has not had the effect ascribed to it by Mons. Depping, of extending everywhere general habits of industry: thirdly, That in consequence of their great maritime trade, the Phœnicians have been, from the most remote period, the principal agents in promoting the civilization of the world: fourthly, That the improvements in the habits and general structure of society take their date only from the Christian era.

The Bible, the two Talmuds, and the writings which have been handed down to us by the Rabbins, plainly demonstrate, by their silence on the subject, that it would be in vain to seek for traces of any species of commerce between the Hebrews and the surrounding nations, before the year of the world 2288, that is to say, before the time of Isaac. Nevertheless, if, contrary to all probability, there did exist, at this early age, any thing that deserved the name of trade, it must have been confined to a traffic in cattle. At any rate it could not be very extended nor very diversified: for otherwise, the records already referred to would have plainly expressed the nature of it, as they have not failed to do in recording the events which signalized the reign of David, at which period the mercantile operations of the Israelites first began to develop and extend themselves.

The Sêfèr of Moses furnishes us with the proof that, prior to their bondage under the Pharaohs, the descendants of Abraham were the importers, and not the manufacturers, of various articles then in use amongst the Asiatics, such as sweet smelling spices, odoriferous powders, worked ivory, &c. The trade in these

\* "The Hebrews, it now appears, were amply provided with the means of instruction, both in secular learning and religious knowledge, so far as these precious gifts were vouchsafed to the age of David and his more immediate successors. The seminaries of the Levites diffused around them, in all the tribes where they were established, the refinement and taste to which the love of letters, of music, and of the kindred arts, never fails to give birth."—*Russell's Connection*, &c. vol. iii. p. 120.

commodities was in a great degree monopolized by the Ishmaelites and the Midianites, who conveyed them, by means of camels, as far as the banks of the Nile, to the country of Misraim, where they met with a ready demand. It will be recollected that it was to Ishmaelitish merchants, coming from Gilead, that Joseph was sold by his brethren. Under the dominion of the kings of Egypt, the Israelites became, by the force of circumstances, thoroughly initiated in the arts of their masters; and if, on this subject, we might be permitted to express an opinion, we should be strongly inclined to say, that it was the Hebrews who, under the superintendence of the Egyptians, raised those stupendous monuments of art which have so justly excited the wonder and admiration of mankind. This opinion is not a new one: it has already been put forth by some writers, but has been as strenuously denied by others. But though it is easy to discredit the authorities which give countenance to the assertion, it is not equally so to produce satisfactory evidence of its being erroneous. The only method in matters of doubt is to persevere in the investigation of facts, and to conduct our inquiries with caution, calmness and impartiality, and with a constant reference to historical traditions. Herodotus, and after him Buxtorff, Simon, and Anquetil affirm that in the building of the three great pyramids 360,000 workmen were employed during a period of twenty years, and that the expense incurred for their support amounted to more than ten millions of francs in garlick, radishes, and onions. 360,000 men constantly occupied during twenty years! What would have been the fate of agriculture, if the Egyptians had expended their own energies in such an employment? The workmen were evidently strangers and captives; beings reduced to slavery, whom it was important to keep constantly employed, in order to prevent them from forming projects of freedom and independence. Nothing is more probable than that the construction of the pyramids was undertaken as a measure of policy. We are aware that the Egyptians, as well as the Syrians, Phœnicians, and Babylonians, crouched beneath the sceptre of their absolute monarchs, and that works which formed a simultaneous occupation for thirty or forty thousand individuals were by no means rare at that period. It is not, however, probable that such poor and coarse food, as that above referred to, would have been provided for the sustenance of men in a state of freedom. With slaves indeed it is otherwise; the bondsman has no rights; and this affords additional evidence of the position we maintain.

When the Czar Peter the Great of Russia first conceived the project of populating the deserts of Ingria and Carelia, and

founded in their solitudes a great and powerful city, from what source did he derive the means of raising up the island of Enigari, clearing the soil, levelling trees, and building the fortress, all which operations required the labour of innumerable hands? The troops of Prince Repnin, the Ingrians, the Carelians, and the people of Novogorod, were unceasingly employed; the governors of the interior received orders to supply thousands of workmen and mechanics; Cossacks, Tartars and Kalmucks, and more especially the Swedish prisoners, were forced to aid in these works undertaken by the Emperor. In the summer of the same year, by order of the Czar, 40,000 men were employed in raising and cutting the stones and wood. A whole nation of artificers, of various tribes and languages, hired at the rate of three copecks (three halfpence) per day, were employed in the digging of dykes and in forming canals. They used neither pick-axe, shovel, nor carriage of any description; but carried, either in bags or in the skirts of their castans, the earth which they had loosened with sticks or with their bare fingers. During the progress of this laborious occupation, they slept in the open air, on a damp soil, in the midst of fogs, and of marshes formed by the rains. A nation which had tasted the blessings of freedom would hardly, we think, have submitted to so cruel and barbarous a treatment. Nevertheless, severe as may have been the labour imposed on the Jews under the dominion of the kings of Egypt, they derived some advantage from their residence in that country. Their unhappy state was not entirely devoid of use to them, as we shall have the opportunity of showing. From the earliest times, as shepherds having no fixed habitation, they were principally occupied in cultivating the soil and in tending their flocks. After they had penetrated into the promised land, and driven the Philistines before them, the latter, being confined to the coasts, were forced, in order to procure sustenance, to become the agents of other nations. Being placed in immediate contact with this active race of people, the Israelites, either in a spirit of rivalry or from some other motive, did not long remain without engaging in foreign traffic. Yet their maritime commerce was not fully established till towards the year of the world 2940 or 2950. We do not think there is any ground for assigning to it a much earlier date. The borders of the sea being principally occupied by the Canaanites,\* the tribe of Zebulun was the only one which, from its geographical position, could trade with the Mediterranean; and this agrees with the prophecies of Jacob and of Moses. “*Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea; and he shall*

\* Canaanite, in the eastern language, signifies *merchant*.

be for an haven of ships; and his border shall be unto Zidon." \*  
 "They shall call the people unto the mountain; there they shall offer sacrifices of righteousness; for they shall suck of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand." †

One of the principal branches of the export trade of the Hebrews consisted of honey made from raisins, or of the syrup extracted from that fruit, called by the same name in Arabic. The territory of Hebron alone furnished Egypt each year with as much as 300 camels could carry. A species of wine, made from honey, is still common in this part of Palestine, and is preferred by many to that which comes from Spain, and obtains a very high price in Egypt, where the wines are very scarce and bad, owing to the inundations of the Nile. It is in all probability this species of honey of which mention is made in Genesis (ch. xliii. v. 11). Bochart, indeed, is of opinion that it is common honey which is there spoken of, and Celsus imagines it to mean the juice of dates; but neither of these suppositions is very probable, as it can hardly be supposed that Jacob sent to Pharaoh an article of such little value as the common produce of the country. ‡

The Hebrews likewise possessed several beverages peculiar to themselves, such as the *schéchâr*, a wine or brandy made of dates bruised in water; *mayar*, a species of beer; *schischi*, a liquor distilled from the leaves of hemp, containing a mixture of other ingredients, and which occasioned a species of intoxication similar to that caused by opium; *sikerâh*, also an intoxicating liquor, made of *hyoscyamus*; *fokkah*, another species of the same beverage, and which is very probably the same as the Persian *figûû*, &c. We are inclined to believe that the trade in these liquors was carried on only in the interior, no mention being made of their exportation in the writings of the Rabbins. The prophet Isaiah, who rarely employs circumlocution, plainly informs us that the Ephraimites were the most determined drunkards in all Israel. He thus begins his xxviii<sup>th</sup> chapter:

"Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat vallies of them that are overcome with wine! The crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim, shall be trodden under feet: the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink; they are swallowed up of wine; they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision; § they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full; there is no place clean."

\* Genesis, ch. xlix. v. 13.

‡ Genesis, ch. xliii. v. 11.

† Deuteronomy, ch. xxxiii. v. 19.

§ The Hebrew word for prophecy.

Schêchâr, in particular, has been often celebrated in verse and in prose.\*

The Hebrews, besides the syrup of honey, had other beverages, held in high estimation, and wines of exquisite flavour, of which they exported a considerable quantity for the consumption of the Egyptians, the Persians, and even of the Greeks. The city of *Chelbon* was known to the latter under the appellation of *Chelybon*, and the country adjoining under that of *Chalybonitis*. The kings of Persia imported wine from Chelbon in the same manner as they drew wheat from the province of Elis, in Greece. According to Monthon, *Chelbon* is the ancient *Aleppo*, and the *Beroë* of the Macedonians is the *Aleppo* of the present day. The Rabbin Aschi, in his commentaries, asserts that helbon is a sweet wine, produced by boiling. The Hebrews extracted wine in the manner used at present, from dried grapes. Several of the writers of the seventeenth century assert that the use of brandy, properly so called, was well known to them. It is an admitted fact that we derive from the Arabs the art of extracting that liquor, as well as of making spirits of wine; and that the terms alembic and alcohol (of which the first syllable is the article, and might be suppressed,) have been handed down to us from that people. *Yain*, the name given to wine, is a primitive word, which Simonis interprets "fermentation." It was amongst the Jews, and other nations of the east, that wine formed a frequent subject of poetry, especially that of the lighter sort. Wine had various denominations, of which several may be

\* A little Hebrew poem, composed in honour of Schêchâr, begins thus:—

"Haschêchâr.

"As the rays of the sun surpass in brilliancy the faint glimmer of the stars of night, so a generous wine surpasses, in its animating influences, all that can relieve the thirst of the sons of Adam. You have seen the recreant tremble at the sound of the trumpet. Observe him! Scarcely has the schêchâr moistened his parched lips, ere he precipitates himself madly into the thickest of the fight: his hand is red with the blood of his enemies, whilst he excites his comrades to follow him.

"Fill, comrades, fill; let sparkling schêchâr, monarch of my soul! inspire the song which celebrates its powers.

"If wine thus elevates him who bows to its sovereignty, it can triumph equally over the infidel who defies it.

"The boldest staggers beneath its potency: tents, intrenchments, battalions, and banners, all appear to reel around him. Now a violent tempest agitates his throbbing breast; now the face of heaven is obscured from his sight; and now a bloody veil appears before his eyes, studded with suns countless as the stars of the firmament.

"Fill, comrades, fill, &c. &c.

"A menace is on his lips; he raises his arm, brandishing his flashing sword; but the weapon escapes from his withering grasp: he himself, subdued by an irresistible power, falls like the lofty fir-tree uprooted by the fury of the wind. Schêchâr has vanquished him! He lies extended at his length! Is it not better to yield to schêchâr than to death?

"Fill, comrades, fill, &c. &c."



signified by the term *alcohol*, and of which one, *thirosch* (new wine), is derived, according to the oriental scholars, from the verb *jârasch* (to possess), from the power which it had of taking possession of the faculties of those who drank it. A passage in Zechariah\* would lead one to suppose that occasionally young women indulged in the use of it. "*Corn shall make the young men cheerful, and new wine the maids.*" The other name, *arcis*, means that which has been trodden under foot. Old wine has also a particular designation. The most celebrated districts where it was made are frequently mentioned in the Bible. Solomon has alluded to those of Engedi. The valley of Sharon contained vineyards which were amongst the most celebrated of Judea, and the wine of which was so rich as to require the addition of two-thirds water.

The first indications of maritime commerce which we discover in Scripture, do not reach further back than the reign of David and Solomon. It may, however, be conjectured that previous to this first national attempt, others had been made by private individuals. Solomon caused several vessels to be constructed in the gulf of Egypt, near the Red Sea, at a place bearing the appellation of *Ezion-geber*, the same which was called *Berenice* in the age of Josephus, and which was not very remote from the city of *Eloth*, in the kingdom of Israel.† In this first attempt Hiram, the king of Tyre, afforded the Jewish monarch important assistance, by furnishing him with several experienced pilots, who conducted his officers as far as *Ophir*, from whence they returned with 450 talents of gold.‡ About the same period, says the Jewish author, they brought to Solomon gold, precious stones, and pine wood, the finest ever yet procured, and which was worked into balustrades for the temple and the royal residence, as well as into harps and psalteries, for the Levites to sing hymns. Another fleet appears to have brought from *Ophir* 666 talents of gold. According to Josephus, no account was kept at the time of the silver imported, because the numerous vessels which Solomon had on the sea of Tarshish, and by means of which he sent merchandise of all descriptions to distant nations, brought him back immense quantities of this metal, as well as

\* Ch. ix. v. 17.

† Schabbath, folio 77 ; Niddah, folio 19.

‡ The Jewish coins reduced in sterling money are—

	£	s.	d.
1 agorah.....	0	0	1½
1 drachm .....	0	0	9
2 drachms made 1 beka or the half shekel .....	0	1	6
2 bekas made 1 shekel .....	0	3	0
60 shekels made 1 mina .....	9	0	0
50 minæ made 1 talent .....	450	0	0
1 talent of gold .....	7200	0	0

ivory, amber, Ethiopian slaves, and apes. It took three years to complete these voyages.\* The letter of Hiram to the Hebrew king finishes thus:—"When by my subjects I have cut down many and large trees of cypress and cedar wood, I will send them to sea, and will order my subjects to make floats of them, and to sail to what place soever of thy country thou shalt desire, and leave them there, after which thy subjects may carry them to Jerusalem; but do thou take care to procure us corn for this timber, which we stand in need of, because we inhabit an island."†

King Solomon appears to have been well satisfied with the proceedings of the Tyrian prince, and to have given him permission to draw yearly from his kingdom 2000 measures of wheat,‡ 2000 baths of oil, and 2000 baths of wine,§ each of which contained 72 quarts (sextaries). We read in the first book of Kings (chap. v. ver. 13, 15.) that Solomon chose from out of Israel 30,000 skilful men, and that he had 80,000 quarrymen in the mountains. The Hebrews, however, who had acquired under their ancient masters, the Egyptians, the talent of stonecutting, were not so skilful as the Tyrians in shaping and preparing wood, and it is on this account that the Jewish king, when he was occupied in the construction of the Temple, applied to the king of Zidon to supply him with some of his best artificers to aid him in his labours. (1 Kings, chap. v. ver. 6.)

Prior to the time of David, the Jews had already commenced trading voyages, by the Red Sea and the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb (*Door of the Tears*), to the eastern and western coasts of Africa, and the shores of Arabia, Persia and the Indies. This commerce did not, however, become extensive till after the days of Saul. His great successor, by his conquest of the kingdom of Edom, came into possession of Eloth and Ezion-geber,|| two towns on the Red Sea, admirably situated for the purposes of trade. David appears to have availed himself, with much discernment, of their geographical position, and of the resources which they presented for turning to account the industry of his subjects. His first care, when established on his throne, was to cultivate commercial relations with *Tarshish* and *Ophir*, the position of which latter place is not yet accurately ascertained, notwithstanding the researches of Rosenmuller, Bochart, and the learned Michaelis. After David, Solomon continued this valua-

\* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, book viii. ch. ii.

† Ibid.

‡ The homer or chomer of wheat is equal to eight bushels.

§ The chomer of oil or wine, or ten baths, is equal to sixty-three imperial gallons, three pints.

|| Ezion-geber, in the Hebrew language, signifies *back-bone*, in consequence of the rocks which were at the entrance of the harbour being like this bone of the human body.

ble branch of commerce. He went in person to Eloth and Ezion-geber,\* fortified these two ports, superintended the construction of some of the largest galleys, and took into his service all the sailors he could find. So active were his exertions, that in a very short time he succeeded in drawing to Palestine the entire commerce of Arabia, of Iran, and of the Ind.

To the names of Ophir and of Tarshish, as well as to those of Babylon, Nineveh, Ecbatana, Susa, Persepolis, and Tyre, we involuntarily attach all those ideas of riches, grandeur, and power, which the human mind is capable of contemplating. In Babylon were concentrated the resources and wonders of the vast empire of Assyria, the immensity of which extended its power and dominion over the whole of Asia, and which in its fall has left a vast chasm in the chain of historical records. It is in the immense ruins of this far-famed city, which cover eighteen leagues of territory, and not far distant from modern Bagdad, that are crowded together the only monuments which remain to us of this mighty empire. Nineveh, its rival, has almost entirely disappeared, Ecbatana has scarcely left a vestige of its former grandeur, and the few relics which have come down to us of the territory of Susa, have hitherto presented only enigmas for inquiry and research. Daniel, as we know, lived in Babylon and died at Susa. Among the Greek historians, there are but two deserving of confidence. Herodotus, who visited Babylon about thirty years after Xerxes, and who, being an eye-witness of the greatness of that city, has, as a faithful chronicler, transmitted to us the local and popular traditions which relate to it; and Ctesias, who filled, during a period of seventeen years, the office of physician to Artaxerxes, the elder brother of Cyrus, at the court of the kings of Persia, and who had passed a considerable portion of his time at Babylon, Persepolis, and Ecbatana. The writings of the latter especially are drawn from authentic sources, but unfortunately our acquaintance with them is only from incomplete quotations and extracts, in all probability not very faithfully given. The question as to the localities of Ophir and Tarshish has been agitated not only in our own time, but likewise during the two preceding centuries, and the multitude of researches which have been made respecting it, and the erudition and learning which it has called forth, sufficiently attest the interest attached to the solution of this intricate problem. So long a voyage, undertaken at such a period, and by which not only an almost incredible amount of gold, but likewise a variety of other rare and precious objects, were procured, certainly forms an epoch in commerce and in the march

\* See the account of M. Leon de la Borde upon *Petræa*, in 1828 and 1829. Paris. 1830.

of the human intellect; and the mystery by which the subject is still surrounded, serves only as a further incentive to our curiosity. There is little doubt but that some valuable information will be elicited, when the eastern coasts of Africa become better known to us, for it is in this quarter chiefly that the science of geography is in its infancy. It appears by the writings of Strabo, that according to some historians, Menelaus had succeeded in effecting a passage over the isthmus of Suez, by means of a canal, formed by the Pharaohs for the junction of the Nile with the Red Sea. We are told that Pharaoh Necho was the author of this great enterprise, and it is added, that after sacrificing in the attempt the lives of 120,000 men, it was altogether abandoned. At the period at which we are writing, undertakings of this description maintain numbers of indigent individuals, but it is very probable, that in an age not remarkable for the practice of humanity, when captives were stimulated to labour by the infliction of the lash, the reverse may have been the case,\* notwithstanding which, the fact of so large a sacrifice may very reasonably be doubted. If this canal ever indeed existed, it must have been only *after* its

\* May we not contemplate Syria, Egypt, and Arabia, as forming by similarity of race, community and language, the foundation of a new empire?—without taking into the account the fertility of a large portion of the territory, what can be more admirable than its geographic position? It comprehends by its ports a large angle of the Mediterranean, touches on the Indian Ocean from the Straits of Babelmandeb to the Persian Gulf, and as a communication with these two seas, it has on one side the Nile and on the other the Red Sea, forming two great rivers parallel in their course, influenced by the same winds and currents, and the union of which, by means of a railroad or canal, would form a point of commercial enterprise for three quarters of the globe. We behold a country every part of which has been marked by prodigies of power, glory, wisdom, and prosperity, and in which the missions of divine power have left the remembrance of the most wonderful miracles. Here are concentrated, as it were, Thebes, Memphis, the Nile, Mount Sinai, Jerusalem, the River Jordan, Tyre, Sidon, Lebanon and Mecca; it is altogether a region of wonders! And do not our minds become impressed with feelings the most sublime, in contemplating the efforts making at this period, to renovate this interesting country, to raise it, as it were, from its shroud, to enable it to shake off the dust of ages, and to march boldly forward to its regeneration? Already is it prepared, by its example, to bring into prominent activity all those portions of the Mediterranean so renowned in former ages for riches and grandeur, and which formed the brilliant theatre of ancient civilization. Two events were reserved for modern times, as a means of resuscitating Egypt, the placing barriers on the inundations of the Nile, and the forming a communication between the two seas. The Nile, which in former periods could either overflow the Delta or leave it altogether without moisture, will in future serve only as a general and regular irrigator. Hereafter the Nile will be under the control of man, and become an immense reservoir, to be directed by his will; its waves, which, rushing to the Mediterranean, were engulfed in its waters, will be stayed in their course, and accumulate to be poured on the parching desert, which will one day rival the Delta in fertility. By means of the barriers and the works attending them, the Nile will in future give life to the sea, and more to the earth, and expend its abundant waters on the adjacent country, and on the sands of the desert. M. Liuant, a French engineer, has the direction of these works; and Mr. Galloway, an English engineer, has undertaken the construction of the iron railroads intended to unite the two seas.

demolition that the Phœnicians and the Hebrews established themselves in the ports of Eloth and Ezion-geber, as, independently of a long journey over a territory which was not under the dominion of the Phœnicians, the port of Ezion-geber was by no means a secure one. The fleet of Jehoshaphat and Ahaziah was cast away on its rocks, and the former of these kings was obliged to fit out a new fleet at Eloth. Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, having been deprived of these two ports by the loss of Idumea, the commerce became interrupted till the reign of Uzziah, who retook Eloth. Rezin, king of Syria, obtained possession of it at the time of Ahaz. While the Tyrians were masters of the commerce of Palestine, they established a depôt at Rhinocorura, between Egypt and Judea, either because a channel of communication existed between this town and the Red Sea, or that merchandize could be transported thence on the backs of camels. The history of the Golden Fleece, in whatever way it may be understood, must lead to the belief that the country of Colchis was extremely rich, which circumstance has induced Dom Calmet, who, it seems, had no great predilection for long voyages, to fix on its locality as the probable site of the celebrated Ophir, called likewise Phaz and Uphaz. We are by this hypothesis left in doubt as to the utility of a port in the Red Sea, since Dom Calmet makes his fleet sail up the Tigris and Euphrates, whilst it might have gone with much more ease from Tyre to the mouth of the Phasis; but as Palmyra (the Tadmor of the Bible) was at no greater distance from the Phasis than 200 leagues, it would have been much easier to have sent caravans than ships. Moreover, until the reign of Mithridates, the northern part of the Euxine was so wholly unknown, that the Palus Meotis was thought to be united with the ocean. In truth, Dom Calmet has done nothing but copy what the old chronicles relate on the subject. Since the heroic ages, the Egyptians, become more timid, had abandoned all maritime commerce with the Indians. Arrian denies that previous to the time of Alexander the voyage from the Arabian to the Persian gulf had ever been undertaken. Eratosthenes maintains that no one had ever advanced more than 1500 stadii beyond the straits of the Red Sea; and lastly, Strabo and Dionysius Periegetes state, that before the time in which they lived scarcely twenty vessels had performed the passage. Most of these authors, with the exception perhaps of Eratosthenes, seem to be unacquainted with the circumnavigation of Ophir and of Tarshish. But the difficulties of their navigation sufficiently account for the length of time occupied in the two voyages. These reasons have induced some orientalists to look for Ophir in Arabia, where Moses mentions a town of that name, but with

a slight difference in the orthography.\* This was the opinion of Agatharchides. According to this author, so great an abundance of gold was to be met with amongst the Alileans and the Cassandrians, that double its weight was given in exchange for iron, treble for brass, and ten times as much for silver. In digging up the soil, they sometimes found pieces of gold so pure as not to need refining. The opinion of Agatharchides is of weight; he was possessed of some valuable information respecting these countries, and M. Malte Brun says, that the coasts of Adel and Ajan are only known to us by his description of them. M. Gosselin, who is likewise a great authority, considers Ophir to have been in Yemen, fifteen leagues from the coast, under the name of *Doffir*, the capital of Balad Hadje. But although the Egyptians had given up navigation, this commerce would have been too lucrative to be abandoned, and the place too much within reach for the secret of the Phœnicians not to have transpired in those countries round about which they were in a manner obliged to coast. Under the Ptolemies, maritime commerce was revived with great activity, and extended to very distant countries, all which is sufficiently well attested. As much as 500,000 sesteria (1,300,000 crowns) were sometimes embarked in an expedition to the Indies, which were converted into merchandize, and afterwards sold at Rome for 100 times their prime cost. The writers of those days gave to those countries washed by the Erythrean seas (the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf) their true name of the Indies, but they have also extended this denomination to the more eastern countries; and since they frequently mention the Indus, the Ganges, and the island of Taprobane, it cannot be doubted but that India, properly so called, was perfectly well known to them, and according to M. de Malte Brun, they even went far beyond it. Although navigators were timid, it is evident that from the time of the Ptolemies, the pilots of the Red Sea were acquainted with the trade winds and monsoons, by the aid of which they sailed to and from India. The Phœnicians, in the reign of Hiram, would not have failed to avail themselves of these pilots, in a sea filled with rocks and shallows; but independently of their assistance, such practised navigators must have been themselves acquainted with the monsoons, since pre-

\* "To prove how various are the opinions of authors relative to the situation of Ophir, it will be sufficient to mention that Arias Montanus identified it with Peru, in the western hemisphere. Josephus imagined that its features coincided with those of Malacca, in the Indian Ocean: and Bochart was satisfied that it could be no other than the Island of Ceylon. Montesquieu, Bruce, D'Anville, and others, favoured the notion that the land of gold must have been in Africa, in a mountainous district beyond the sources of the Blue River and the remote bounds of the Ethiopian nation. Gosselin and Prideaux produce good reasons for their belief that the place to which Solomon traded was situated in the southern parts of Arabia."—*Russell's Connection*, &c. vol. iii. p. 135.

vious to the time of Solomon, the Gerrheens a people of Arabia, of Chaldean origin, went to India for merchandize, which they brought to Babylon and Tyre, which shows that this trade was known to the Tyrians. Ophir has therefore very naturally been sought for in Taprobane, in the Golden Chersonesus, in the island of *Samotra*, understanding by it *Sumatra*, and not *Ceylon*, according to some modern authors. Josephus, who mentions Ophir by the name of Sopheirah, (as it is denominated in the Septuagint,) calls it a country of India. St. Jerome also affirms it to be an island of that country; and according to Tzetzes, quoted by Ortelius, Ophath is an island or peninsula full of gold, in Hindostan. Of all the opinions promulgated on this subject, the most probable appears to be that of M. Malte Brun, who considers Ophir to have been in the Delta formed by the mouths of the river Ava; and the description given of it by Ptolemy, as abounding in the precious metals, as well as the name\* corresponding with that of one of the branches of the stream, are strongly corroborative of his opinion. It is hardly worth alluding to the hypothesis of Origen, who, misled by a similarity of consonants, and by a passage of the Chaldaic paraphrase, where the fleet of Solomon is in several places called the African fleet, fancied that Ophir must mean Africa. Nor need we dwell upon the assertions of D'Anville, who is in general so exact, precise and satisfactory in matters of topography, nor upon those of Bruce, or of Huet, or of Heeren, since, however slight the examination we might enter into, it would lead us too far away from our subject, without throwing any new light upon the question. All the nations on the coast of Palestine, and principally the Philistines, trafficked in slaves. Joel (chap. iii. v. 6) reproaches the Tyrians and Sidonians with having kidnapped Jews, and sold them to the Greeks.† It is however to be observed, to the honour of the Hebrew nation, that this infamous commerce was not allowed in Israel.‡

The Hebrews must, no doubt, have traded in balsams, for if we are to give credit to Josephus, Diodorus Siculus, Pliny the younger, and Justinian, the *tseru*, a precious balsam, known to botanists

\* *χερσωνησοειδης, εος*, a peninsula, from *χερρος*, or *χερρος γη*, terra quæ non aratur.

† The carrying off of Eumeus, related by Homer, and several passages of the two Grecian epics, give testimony to the traffic in slaves by the Phœnicians.

‡ How is it that the Jews of Europe have so far deviated from the noble example of their ancestors; for we see by the various controversies in the provincial Councils, held in 829 at Mayence, Paris, Lyons and Toulouse, and also by the Edict of Louis le Débonnaire, that the Jews, who were the greatest capitalists of the Western Empire, pursued with unspeakable mercilessness and eager cupidity their infamous traffic of slaves conjointly with the Arabs of Spain; and their unfortunate victims were either prisoners of war, or children belonging to the Christians of Gaul, Germany, and Great Britain!!! (Pagi Critica ex Chronic. Saxonice. Huntindon & Hoveden ad ann. 828, § 11, 12, p. 537, and 829, p. 539.)

under the name of *amyris opobalsamum*, and which still grows in the desert of Medina, was at that period to be found only in the garden of the kings of Judea, which was situated in the province of Jericho, the warmest spot in the country, near Hazazon-Thamar and not far from Engedi. Hence the Arabs frequently denominated Jericho, "The City of Balm."\* During the wars of Judea, the Jews wished to destroy this garden, but were prevented by the Romans, and, following the example of Pompey, the Vespasian emperors caused a balsam tree to be borne in their triumphs. This shrub resembled the pine, except that it was shorter in its growth, and according to the above-mentioned authors, it was cultivated in the same manner as the vine. The pastoral and laborious life led by the Israelites, before they sought to enlarge the bounds of their territory, or to destroy whole nations in pursuance of that end, and of the divine commands, is not devoid of interest. They knew that man had been doomed, after his fall, to till the soil, and they felt a conviction of the important truth, so often repeated in the books of Solomon—that "Idleness is the parent of want."† "That he who sleeps in summer, instead of gathering his harvest, and neglects his labour in winter, for fear of the cold, deserves to beg and find no bread."‡ "That plenty is the natural consequence of perseverance and industry."§ "And that a humble lot, with peace of mind, is preferable to great riches."|| And hence, also, in the Book of Proverbs, and indeed throughout the Scriptures, what is denominated labour, business, property, relates almost always to the cultivation of the soil. Fields, meadows, vines, sheep, and oxen, furnish the prophets with the greater part of their metaphors. Princes and chiefs are styled pastors, "their people are their flocks;" to govern is to "let them graze." Thus the Hebrews sought their subsistence only in the most natural of possessions,

\* Palestine is, at the present time, very nearly what it was in the time of Moses; dates and grapes ripen together as formerly, in the neighbourhood of Jericho; the date requires a temperature of 21 degrees, the vine 22 at the utmost, as it ceases to flourish in too warm a climate. The medium temperature of Palestine is calculated, therefore, to have been in ancient times between 21 and 22 degrees (Réaumur); the temperature of Jerusalem is, at the present day, computed to be within the same limits. It is not so in France, the general aspect of which has undergone considerable change from the clearing and cultivation of lands; the summers have become, in several provinces, less fervid, and the winters less cold. In the reign of Philip Augustus (12th century) the vine-dressers of Beauvais presented themselves amongst the concourse assembled for the provision of the royal household: at the present day, a vine-gathering at Beauvais is scarcely possible. In the sixteenth century, there existed in the Vivarais productive vines, in spots, where they have now completely ceased to ripen. Old chronicles relate, that in ancient times the vine was cultivated in England, and it is well known, that the Emperor Probus granted to the Britons permission to plant the vine. These changes are produced by human labour, and are not to be attributed to any decrease in the caloric heat of the sun.

† Proverbs, x. 4.

‡ Ibid. v.

§ Ch. xx. 4 and 13.

|| Ch. x. 1.



that is to say, in lands and in cattle, from which two things are derived all that constitutes the riches of mankind. The former state of Palestine must not be judged of by that to which it is at present reduced. From the time of the crusades to the period when it became subject to the Turks, the Holy Land has been the theatre of cruel and perpetual wars, which have destroyed its population, and caused its soil to be uncultivated,—and now, reduced almost to a desert, it presents to the traveller nothing but ruins, wretched villages, and a territory overgrown with weeds, which prove how great must once have been the natural fertility. The Turks, indeed, have neglected it, as they have neglected most even of their own possessions; and numerous tribes of Bedouin Arabs are allowed to roam about and pillage and murder the inhabitants with impunity. In order to form an idea of what Judea formerly was, we must have recourse to the ancient writers, and consult Josephus and our Bible. The gigantic bunch of grapes brought by the spies to Moses, sufficiently proves the Holy Land not to have been a sterile country.

Jerusalem is the ancient parent of other cities, both in the eastern and western world—the great theatre of past events, and though now mute and solitary, is perhaps prophetic of the future by the tokens with which she is now marked.—To see her is to hear her. But let us enter her walls. Here stands the gate of Bethlehem; a few steps from it may be seen a broken and tottering tower, once the tower of David, the poet king, the writer of the Psalms; he, who in the height of glory and of power, sighed forth the Miserere. Further on, in a narrow and ill-paved street, on a rising ground, the foot strikes against a broken capital, which had been placed there to mark the spot where Veronica, a compassionate woman, stood to cast perfumes and flowers on the head of Christ, when fainting under the burden of his cross. The column to which this capital belonged is still standing in an angle between the two gates, and is said to be the same to which the Son of Man was bound, like a criminal to the stake, when he yielded his quivering members to the scourge. We stand then in that sorrowful road, between the summit of Golgotha, where all was accomplished, and the bitter cup of woe was drained to the dregs, and the valley of Jehosaphat, where it is imagined by some the final judgment will be rendered. Let us pass the second gate, where are to be seen a mendicant and a woman in antique drapery, bearing on her head an earthen vessel, resembling that which Rebecca presented to Eleazar, the ambassador of Abraham, when she drew water from the well of Siloam. On the right stands a house which is said to have been that of the luxurious Dives; and the left, that of Lazarus; in front is a gallery from the top

of which were pronounced the words *Ecce Homo*. It stands upon an arcade thrown across the street to serve as a communication from the palace of Pilate to the ancient prisons of Jerusalem, in which Jesus was confined, and which are now only a heap of ruins. The habitation of Pilate is still the residence of the governor of Jerusalem; it has lost only its principal staircase, *la scala sancta*, which was descended by the Redeemer, in his way to the place of crucifixion, and which, transported to Rome in the time of Sextus, was placed in a chapel adjoining St. John of Lateran. From a remote chamber, which must be entered stealthily, in order to elude the vigilance of the janizaries, may be discerned Mount Calvary and the holy sepulchre enclosed within the ruins of a church surmounted by two domes.

What was styled the Temple of Solomon, is now ruined, destroyed, overthrown. The Jews have never been able to restore it since it was prostrated before the cross: but on its imperishable base (within a space which is entered by eight porticoes,) stands the magnificent mosque of Omar, venerated by all Mussulmans. This elegant building, painted in green and gold, surrounded by a white wall, which is pierced at intervals by light and graceful arcades, is one of the most beautiful modern edifices of the East. It leads to the valley of Jehosaphat, where Judaism humbly keeps its place among the tombs. The synagogue is hidden, but the memorials of those Israelites who came from far countries, to take their last rest in the valley of judgment, give irresistible evidence of their undying faith. Jacob still causes his bones to be borne to the land of his fathers!

A little further onwards is the pool of Bethesda, celebrated for its efficacy in paralytic affections; and leaving the city by the gate of St. Stephen, a short path conducts the traveller to the Mount of Olives, and the Garden of Gethsemane, at the foot of the valley of Jehosaphat, and on the sandy bed of the dried up brook Cedron. Here he will find, among the wells of Neomi, the tomb of Absalom and the field of Aeldama.

We have already remarked that the Hebrews sought their subsistence in the riches of the earth. There never was, in fact, a people, who devoted themselves so completely to agricultural pursuits as the Hebrews, since their territory sufficed for their consumption. Not that they were altogether ignorant of other arts. We have already observed, that they understood the fabrication of metals, and the cutting and carving of wood and precious stones. They had also among them joiners, carpet-makers, embroiderers and perfumers.\* From the time of Moses they possessed excellent workmen, of whom Bezaleel and Aholiab (who

\* Fleury, Mœurs des Israélites.

constructed the tabernacle) were examples; but, whether these famous artificers had been instructed by the Egyptians, or whether they were endued with supernatural power, as Scripture gives us reason to think, it does not appear that they had any successors, nor that, until the time of the kings, there were any Israelites who worked professionally for the public.

Some passages of Scripture prove, that at the commencement of the reign of Saul, they had no workmen who understood the forging of iron, and that they were compelled to resort to the Philistines for the sharpening of the tools which they used in tillage; to which necessity they were perhaps driven by the oppression of that people, who would not suffer them to fabricate arms.

There is also reason to think that bread was not publicly sold, and that they were not in the habit of keeping it by them, since we find the high-priest, Ahimelech, giving David some of the shew-bread, which it is not probable he would have done, if it could have been procured elsewhere. This seems the more likely, as the Witch of Endor made bread expressly for Saul, when she gave him food to restore him to his senses.\* It is also certain, that every house had its own oven, as intimated in the threatening passage, which says, that the people shall be reduced by so sore a famine, that ten women shall bake their bread in the same oven.† Each Israelite cultivated his own inheritance, which had been portioned out to his ancestors in the time of Joshua. He could not change his locality, nor impoverish or enrich himself to any considerable extent—the Law of the Jubilee having provided against it, by revoking every 49th year the alienation of lands, and forbidding, every sabbatical or seventh year, the exaction of the payment of debts. The uncertainty of obtaining reimbursement increased the difficulty of borrowing, which likewise tended to prevent them from impoverishing themselves. The impossibility, besides, of acquiring territorial property repressed ambition and restlessness; each contented himself with the lot which was his birthright, and devoted all his efforts to the improvement of it, knowing that it would certainly belong to his posterity.‡ This attachment was, indeed, a reli-

\* Samuel, ch. xxviii. v. 24.

† At the present time in Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, dough for bread is prepared daily in every family, and sent to a common oven, established in the cities, from whence it is carried to be eaten.

‡ We deeply regret, that in the learned exposition of M. Depping, on the double character of mercantile selfishness and religious fervour of the Jews of the middle ages, he has maintained an absolute silence respecting the Samaritans of our day. That fraction of the tribe of Joseph, which has preserved its ancient characteristics of profound and lively nationality, as they were given by the inspired liberator in the desert, has, in manners, habits, or principles, nothing which resembles the European

gious duty, since it was founded on the laws of Moses, and a memorable instance is given of it in the refusal of Naboth to sell the inheritance of his fathers.

We have endeavoured to shew that the Israelites, who, under David and Solomon, had carried on a foreign trade, after the time of Hosea, owing to the superior skill and competition of the Phœnicians, altogether abandoned it. Their traffic was reduced to an internal one, and their navigation altogether ceased. It cannot therefore be correct to say, that they were the principal means of communicating the arts of industry to other countries, or that they were the sole possessors of those arts. On the contrary, if a people are to be judged of by their ordinary habits and pursuits, it may safely be asserted, that they preferred the pastoral life to all others.\* The Jew did not seek to acquire riches in adventurous voyages, nor had he, like the Phœnician, any taste for a life of turmoil and danger. His enjoyments were of a more peaceful character; he was satisfied with small gains. The extent of his ambition was, to sit under the shadow of his own palm, to gather his dates, olives, and figs; to milk his ewes, to tend his cattle, and to behold them enjoying their luxuriant pasturage. The objects which called forth his regret in captivity, were, the pleasant banks of the Jordan, on whose willows he had suspended his harp and psaltery.† Religion lent her aid in giving strength to these sentiments. The promises of God to his people regarded blessings such as more immediately descended from above. He spoke not to them

Jews,—calculating, and avaricious traders, who have retrograded to the worship of the golden calf. It is well known, that the Samaritans who dwell at Naplouse, the Green Road, named by Jacob “Halket-assamara,” where he fixed his abode, as it is stated in the Book of the Law, have synagogues, houses and cemeteries peculiar to themselves, and that they neither eat nor form any connexion with the Jews, whom they anathematize. Their laws are however the same, and contain 613 precepts, but there are some capital differences in those which concern purification, and the Samaritans refuse to eat of animals killed by the Jews.

\* The *Bedouin Arabs*, whether of Asia or of Africa, live as their ancestors formerly lived, in Mesopotamia, (to day Diarbekr,) at the time of Abraham and Hagar—that is, scattered over the territory of Algiers. They rear numerous flocks of cattle, speak the Arab tongue with purity, preserve their simple, patriarchal manners, dwell in tents, and retain all the habits of their Asiatic brethren. Those tribes which inhabit the environs of Algiers are under subjection; those which wander towards the mountains of the south, remain independent, and are extremely hospitable. The name of *Bedouin* is derived from an Arab term, which may be rendered by *campestris*; they are likewise denominated *Scinitar*, from the Greek word *σκηνίτης* (in tentoriis habitans). The tribes originally *Saracens*, or more properly *Hagarenes*, that is to say, in Arabic, descendants of *Hagar* and *Abraham*, by their son *Ishmael*, have spread themselves from the desert of Arabia, to the south of that continent, as the Scythians and Tatars have done towards the north.

† *Elisha* when called before the King of Israel to predict the future, demanded that a minstrel should be brought him,—“And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord was upon him, and he said,” &c. &c.

of gold, nor of silver, nor of jewels, nor of costly furniture, nor of other riches produced by the ingenuity of man; but he promised them refreshing showers to fertilize the earth, and to cause it to bring forth fruit in abundance. He gave them food and raiment, safety, and peace, and victory over their enemies. He made them to increase and multiply. He blessed their flocks, their herds, their storehouses, and their wine-presses. Such were the gifts which the Almighty vouchsafed to shower upon the Israelites, and the object of which was to impress upon their hearts the important truth, that they were specially appointed to uphold, in the midst of a heathen and idolatrous world, the worship of Him, the only true God, and the Creator of all things both in heaven and earth.\* It is interesting to follow, in the valuable work of M. Depping, the track of the Israelitish nation in Europe, during the middle ages. He prefaces it by recounting the recital of their melancholy adventures and the principal events of their primitive state. In the latter pages of his introduction, he follows them from the borders of the Euphrates, where they wandered with their flocks, to the philosophical schools of Alexandria, where their Rabbins, in constant contact with the Grecian Sophists, insensibly imbibed that tincture of Platonism, which they endeavoured, by means of subtle arguments, to incorporate with the doctrines of Moses, and those of the Magi. Some curious details on this subject are also to be found in the Theological Literature of the Asiatic Jews; who carried the mania for explanations to so extravagant a pitch, as to maintain that every passage of the Bible was capable of 600,000 interpretations.

We become thus acquainted with the nature of the education bestowed on those Jews who mingled with the European nations. We see this mighty and wonderful nation, so long the chosen and protected of God, ultimately dispersed, abandoned, proscribed, and cast out of the pale of human laws. They become altogether a discarded race, to whom the other nations, Christians as well as Musselmans, as if by common consent, refuse even a resting-place. For guides and instructors they had no better than sophists, casuists, and dreaming mystifiers; and their subversion and exile was the more painful and irksome, as they

\* There is no doubt of the palm, the fig, and the olive, as well as the vine, having been cultivated on a large scale by the Jews. The city of Jericho was called "The City of Palms." The Bible speaks of the palm trees of *Deborah*, situated between *Ramah* and *Bethel*, and of those on the banks of the Jordan. The Hebrew coins bear the distinct impression of palm trees, with their fruit, which, as well as the bunches of grapes, were stamped on them as marks. Pliny, Theophrastus, Tacitus, Josephus, Strabo and Diodorus, speak also of groves of palms, situated in Palestine. The two last-mentioned historians are forcible in their praise of the vines of Judea, and in numerous verses of the Bible mention is made of vineyards. The Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated at the termination of the vintage.

had no other code of religion and morals, than what was contained in books, fitted only to lead their minds astray, and render them objects of suspicion in whatever quarter they might endeavour to fix themselves. We do not mean to assert, that when they were driven from their native land, they carried with them those mysterious writings; but most of them were, more or less, imbued with those extravagant ideas which took their root in the schools of Susa and Babylon, and transmitted to their children the practices and absurd belief which the doctors of those schools had erected into dogmas. The same people, whose obstinate resistance to the Romans caused the destruction of Jerusalem, seem, in their exile, to have patiently submitted to the yoke which was imposed on them by their own doctors, and whilst they revolted against the emperors, they became the willing slaves of the Talmud; comforting themselves in all their vicissitudes with the doctrine held out to them by their learned professors, that circumcision was the sure path to eternal happiness. We lay aside with regret the work of M. Depping, but are anxious to arrive at the conclusion of those questions which we have proposed to ourselves to solve. It has been already stated, that the Phœnicians, and, at a subsequent period, the Carthaginians,\* their descendants and rivals, were, by means of industry, by their knowledge of the arts and manufactures, by their extensive commerce, and their experience in navigation, the first promoters of civilization in the world.† And it was to the Phœnicians, at once their neighbours and enemies, that the Jews of early times were in the habit of resorting for artisans on those grand but rare occasions, when they were desirous of increasing the magnificence of their religious cere-

\* History of the Carthaginians, by M. le Docteur Botticher, Berlin; Of the Religion of the Carthaginians, by Münter, Copenhagen; The *Idée*, from Heeren, Leipsic; Discoveries of the Carthaginians and Greeks in the Atlantic Ocean, by M. Lelewel, Warsaw and Paris.

“Carthage, the most powerful of their settlements (Themisond), according to a tradition, the truth of which there is no reason to question, owed its origin to the crime of a king of Tyre, who, urged by avarice or ambition, murdered his brother-in-law, the priest of Melcarth, their national god. Many of the citizens, offended and alarmed by this atrocity, resolved to leave their native land, and placing themselves under Elissa, the widow of the slaughtered prince, they put to sea, and directed their course towards Africa. They disembarked in the bay in which Utica and Tuneta were already built, and fixing on a narrow promontory which runs out into the sea, they agreed to pay for it a price, or perhaps an annual tribute, to the Libyans, who claimed the property of the soil, &c.”—*Connection of Sacred and Profane History*, vol. iii. p. 163.

† Heeren is of opinion that the Phœnicians, like most other commercial nations, began by making piratical excursions to the towns and villages adjacent to the shores they frequented. This conjecture carries with it such an air of probability, that we willingly adopt it, although it does not rest upon any certain authority. In the history of that nation, it is unfortunately but too clearly proved, that they, as well as the other nations of antiquity, engaged in the traffic of slaves.

monies, by the addition of curious and highly-wrought embellishments. It was the city of Tyre which furnished Solomon with the architect for his temple, and with the sculptors who were employed in its embellishment; and this beautiful and magnificent edifice, the account of whose construction and decoration we read of in Scripture, and which was not unknown to the ancient Greeks, may be considered as a model of Phœnician architecture. The trade of the Tyrians, which embraced the borders of the Red Sea, and the islands of the Grecian Archipelago, extended itself in one direction to the sources of the Ganges, and in another beyond the Pillars of Hercules, penetrated into the Northern Ocean, beyond the Britannic Isles, explored the coasts of Africa, and attempted the circumnavigation of that vast continent. This vast commerce was the *Briareus* of the Asiatic Mythology, which brought into direct communication Egypt and Greece, Chaldea and Etruria. In those days, indeed, a merchant was not simply a mere purchaser and seller of goods, whose knowledge was confined solely to money and merchandize, but something of a far higher cast. He was a sort of intellectual and moral agent between different nations, who, among the commodities which he conveyed from one to another, carried with him those objects which were the signs of moral and religious feelings. Through his instrumentality knowledge was disseminated. The gods of unknown nations passed from hand to hand, and were at one and the same time, articles of commerce, objects of worship, and specimens of art. The Phœnicians, who alone possessed the means of this enormous traffic, thus became the common agents of other nations. From this circumstance, no doubt, arose that prodigious confusion of mythologies and of symbols which overloaded the religious creeds of the Asiatic kingdoms, and which may be observed in the second era of Grecian civilization, notwithstanding that its rudiments, drawn from an eastern source of a still earlier date, had, until that period, maintained its original simplicity. This was the origin of those idols of divers forms, attributes and symbols, and those monstrous combinations of beings of a double nature, which became incorporated into the religious systems of Egypt, of Chaldea, of Phrygia, and even of Phœnicia itself. These images, hawked about by the bold and adventurous navigators of the latter nation, and afterwards exposed in their warehouses to the credulity and curiosity of the Peloponesian population of the islands and continents of Greece, became, by this means, the first objects of a rude worship, and the earliest models of their art. Symbols of these are still occasionally discovered, variously modified according to the progress of civilization, upon the primitive monuments of Greece and Etruria.

The Phœnicians (so called by the Greeks)\* which were a part of the Aramaic or Syriac race, were spread over the territory which is bounded on the south and west by the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, on the east by the Tigris, and on the north by the mountains of Armenia. In this immense country, the portion which they occupied consisted of that part of the coast which lies between Mount Lebanon and the sea. Their towns were erected on the margin of the shores of the neighbouring isles, and at the foot of the mountain. The limited extent of their territory, and the timber which they procured in abundance from Mount Hermon, Mount Lebanon and Mount Bashan, were instrumental in rendering the Phœnicians, at a very early period, a commercial, a navigating, and ultimately a colonizing people. The spot which presented itself for their first excursions was the Isle of Cyprus. This was about their first station in the Mediterranean. They were not long in extending their settlements to the western extremities of that sea, exporting to the different places the manufactures of the mother-country, such as trinkets, metals in various forms, glass ware and woollen and cotton goods, and importing from thence in return wine, oil and dried fruits.

It was, however, in the north of Africa and in Spain that were established the greater part of the Phœnician colonies. Although we are ignorant of the precise manner in which they became acquainted with the Spanish continent, we know from authentic sources that they traded with that country more than 1000 years before the Christian era. The *Tarshish* spoken of in the Hebrew books, is indubitably the *Tartessus*, of which mention is made in the Greek writings—a generic term, adopted probably to designate the rich countries of the west. According to ancient tradition, the Phœnicians, when they first visited Spain, found gold in quantities so abundant, that all the utensils made by the inhabitants were formed of that metal. Not only were their vessels freighted with it, but, laying aside all their instruments and weapons composed of less precious materials, they constructed others of gold, and even forged anchors of silver. They established colonies or factories at Gades (*Cadiz*), at Malaga, at Hispalis (*Seville*), and other places; and leaving the *Heres* and the *Turditanians*, the ancient inhabitants of their countries, to work the mines, they confined themselves to exchanging the merchandize of the east, and the produce of their own manufactories, for the metals, the wool, and the fruits of Spain. They also kept up an active trade with Babylon. Caravans evidently descended through lower Syria by way of Balbec (*Heliopolis*), passing by Tadmor (*Palmyra*), which place Solomon may have in all probability re-

\* Herodotus, liv. iv. c. 104.



paired, fortified and aggrandized, although it certainly existed before his time, notwithstanding what the Hebrew historians say on the subject.

The oriental branch of the Phœnician commerce took a northerly direction. The people of *Javan*, *Tubal* and *Mesheck* were great traders. They brought to market slaves and brazen vessels. Those of the house of *Thogarmah* trafficked in mules and horses. By *Javan* is meant the *Ionian Isles*; *Tubal* and *Mesheck* are always understood to signify the *Tibareni* and the *Moschi*, tribes dwelling at the north of Armenia, near the Euxine and Mount Caucasus, and designated in the Hebrew writings by the name of *Thogarmah*. From the three first mentioned countries the Phœnicians obtained slaves and copper utensils. Cappadocia, and the countries situated south of the Euxine, formerly furnished slaves in such abundance, as to lower their price to 4 drachmas a head.\* The Grecian colonies established north of the Euxine, likewise procured a considerable number of slaves from Scythia. In this respect we follow Josephus, who generally employs but one name to designate those neighbouring countries which had the same population. His view of this subject bears a striking character of exactness and truth. Copper is to this day very abundant in those countries, and the vases made of it are highly esteemed. Armenia Minor was celebrated for its horses, horsemen and mules. It encouraged the breed of the *Nysean race*, from amongst which the satrap of the province chose annually 20,000 colts, to send to the King of Persia; from which circumstance some critics have contended, that by the term saddle-horse is to be understood the *Nysean horses*, or war-horses.†

If in the preceding statement there is nothing which indicates a great degree of industry as to manufactured works, on the part of the Phœnicians, beyond that of a simple exchange of commo-

\* The price of a slave at that period was about 3s. At the present day the traffickers in human flesh ask for each of their victims from 2000 to 2200 l., about £80 sterling. Slavery not only degrades, but kills its victims: it goes far towards the extinction of the species, which extinction would have been already consummated without the support afforded by a new nourishment. Excessive labour is in great measure the reason of the mortality among the poor blacks. Want of care, unwholesome diet, unmerciful and frequent chastisement, sufferings physical and moral, and the feelings of dark despair which they engender, are so many concurring causes. This mortality is of frightful extent. M. M. Hilliard d'Auberteuil, Col. Malenfant, Gregoire, Moreau de Tours, Humboldt, Poivre, &c. relate that from 1680 to 1776, viz. in ninety-two years, more than 900,000 negroes had been imported into St. Domingo: in 1777 there remained in that colony only 290,000; of whom only 140,000 were black Creoles. In the Island of Cuba, the mortality, according to Humboldt, is 7 per cent. per annum. *The Anti-Slavery Monthly Reporter*, No. 26, states a loss in the slave population, from 1818 to 1824, amounting to 31,419.

† The province of Khorassan, or the "country of the sun," is the native country of the famous Nysean horses, so much extolled in history.

dities, we are not to conclude that their country was unproductive in raw materials for exportation, nor in manufactures to exchange for the goods it imported; for possessing only a narrow strip of coast, and being forced to seek abroad for the first necessities of life, they were not only a commercial, but a manufacturing people. Although it must be allowed in the first instance that they possessed but few raw materials with the exception of their timber, yet they were considerably advanced in the mechanical arts. Thus, all the glass used in the ancient world was the produce of Phœnicia, which alone possessed the species of sand necessary for its formation. But if the architecture of the ancients furnished little or no occasion for this article in the formation of windows, it caused, on the other hand, a considerable consumption of glass ware for the table and for mirrors. In this branch of industry, Sidon was the Venice of the ancient world. In the prophet Ezekiel we read of the glories of Tyre, the superb queen of the Mediterranean, and the vast bazaar of the eastern world, opening her ports to receive the merchandize of every land. Hither the Egyptians resorted to dispose of their manufactures of fine cloth, and the Greeks for the purchase of slaves. By land her gates received the caravans of Arabia Felix, arriving from Eden and from Canneh, heavily laden with precious gems, with spices, and with stuffs. At the period in which the prophet penned his magnificent description of this city, Rome had not yet taken her rank among nations, but was slowly converting her cabins into cottages, and waiting for the time when her cottages should give place to houses and palaces.

The Phœnicians fabricated, as we have already mentioned, a great number of ornaments, in ivory, amber, odoriferous woods, gold, silver, ebony, and brass; for it was they who ministered to the luxury of neighbouring and distant nations.\* Isaiah gives us a formidable list of the jewels and ornaments worn by the beauties of Judah, and it is probable that the ladies of Damascus and the other towns of Syria and Phœnicia, were not behindhand in the decorations of the toilet. In the Odyssey we read of the Phœnicians who frequented some of the Grecian ports, carrying with them

\* The superior richness of the urns and ornaments discovered in Ireland, compared with those found in English barrows, is fully acknowledged by Sir Richard Hoare. "The Irish urns were," he says, "in general more ornamented, and the articles of gold also richer and more numerous."—*Tour in Ireland, General Remarks.*

"Within the limits of my own knowledge," says Rev. W. Hamilton, "golden ornaments have been found to the amount of near one thousand pounds."—*Letters concerning the Coast of Antrim.*

In like manner a variety of swords, discovered in Ireland, are as exactly and as minutely, to every apparent mark, the same as found in the field of Cannæ, which are said to be Carthaginian.—*Governor Pownall's Account, 1774, to the Society of Antiquaries.*

jewels and ornaments for the women, which they exchanged for articles of consumption (*βίολον*), probably corn, wine and oil. The cities of Phœnicia, girt with walls and rich with industry, rose up in the midst of this country long before Athens was in existence. Their principal manufactures were woollen cloths and dyed cottons, to which latter the *murex*, which abounded in their seas, furnished them with the means of imparting the most brilliant colours, causing the tissues of the Phœnicians to be held in such high estimation by all nations, that we can assign no other limits to their commerce in this manufacture, but those of the then known world. Nevertheless these shell fish contained so small a quantity of real colour, that those mantles or purple stuffs which derived their tint from them were sold at an extravagant price, and were only attainable by a few individuals of great wealth and high rank.

At this epoch the Tyrians founded, on the northern coast of Africa, the city of Carthage, and beyond the Straits of Hercules, at the point of Bœtica, the town of Gades, situated on the sea coast, about two-thirds of the way between Tyre and the Tin Islands, which they had discovered in their long voyages at the extremity of Britain, called by the natives Sorlingues, but to which the Phœnicians gave the name of Cassiterides or Tin Islands, from their having there obtained a supply of that metal.\* If we seek to discover the cause of the decline of Phœnician prosperity, it may be accounted for, first, by the foundation of Carthage, which quickly absorbed all the commerce of Spain; secondly, by the manufacturing industry of the Grecian colonies of Asia Minor, which maintained an active connexion with Thapsacus, on the Euphrates; thirdly, by the grand political commotions which overthrew the western part of Asia; and, lastly, by that law which, in the progress of events, prevents the continued duration, for a series of ages, of any nation which has but partly attained the highest degree of civilization.

It is a subject worthy of notice, that the predictions which the Jewish prophet addressed to Tyre have been exactly accomplished. That once proud city, *whose merchants were princes and whose traffickers were the honourable of the earth*, is now a rock, on which fishermen dry their nets. The "*daughter of Tyre*" has undergone a no less striking change. It is now 2000 years since the names of Tyre and Carthage, the two greatest commercial powers of antiquity, have been struck out of the list of nations.

\* The intercourse in very ancient times of *Albion* and *Jerne* (two Celtic names) with Spain (Gades and Gallicia), appears to be a fact that does not admit of question. The great probability is, that from the latter country (Spain), on the coast of which they are known to have early established themselves, the Phœnicians, the first great prosecutors of navigation and commerce, carried forward the chain of colonisation to Britain, Ireland, Gaul, &c. and there planted arts, letters, and religion.

Thus have we briefly attempted to show the large share which the Phœnicians took, by means of their navigation and commerce, in the diffusion of industry, of the arts, and of religious worship throughout every other nation of the ancient world.

A question of the most important nature is left to the intelligence of our era to solve. It is to determine by means of the sculptured monuments which science has recently acquired, what part of its religious images and sacerdotal types were brought into Greece from Upper Asia, by the commerce of which the Phœnicians had in the earliest ages of society obtained the monopoly, and which they sought to maintain even at the expense of life itself, since the human sacrifices, which never failed to accompany their establishments, had for its sole object to serve their interests and to protect themselves in the enjoyment of their monopoly. The painted vases of primitive formation, and Grecian medals of every date, furnish certain references on this point, which in our opinion have not hitherto met with the attention they merit, as they might prove excellent guides to that small number of the truly learned, who, in their researches into antiquity, seek to elucidate the characteristic traits and features of so important an epoch of history. Time has obliterated, and, it is to be feared irreparably, the great monuments of art, and of the religious worship of this people. Their temples are annihilated, and with them the idols they enclosed. It is perhaps, however, not impossible to trace some feeble idea of these ancient representations in the monuments of other days. The Hercules (*Melkart*) of Tyre, and of Tarsus, the Venus (*Astarté*) of Sidon, the Atargatis of Ascalon, have not disappeared so entirely, but that some idea of them may be gleaned even from these memorials, at once recent and superannuated, which characterize the expiring struggles of Polytheism, when, in order to dispute the ground with Christianity, the idols of former ages were drawn from their ancient sanctuaries under the absurd and hopeless expectation of reanimating a creed already extinguished.\* It is thus that the worship of Astarte Baalis, the Great Triple-headed

\* The *Ismenian Apollo* was worshipped at Thebes, and *Esmeum* appears to have been amongst the Phœnicians a divinity endowed with the same attributes as the *Æsculapius* of the Greeks; and further, the sea-goddess *Ino-Leucothoe*, is styled by Homer, daughter of Cadmus; and although Homer has not explained what was to be understood by Cadmus, yet it is not at all improbable that in the Grecian mythology there may be found ideas of navigation, and recollections of maritime origin. There existed in the Isle of Cyprus a temple consecrated to the goddess *Aphrodite*, who bore a strong resemblance to the Syrian *Astarte*, which proves a connection between them and the Greeks of Laconia. In the Island of Thasos, and on the coast of Thrace, gold mines were discovered. Herodotus relates that those of the island were opened for the first time by the Phœnicians, adding that the Tyrian Hercules (*Melkart*) had a temple on the spot. Herodotus is generally so correct, that we are strongly inclined to rely on his statement, although his partiality for all that relates to Upper Asia and to Egypt renders him liable to be deceived by slight appearances.

Goddess of Syria, again re-appears in the sacred city of Hierapolis, at an epoch when it had long fallen into disuse, and that the Paphian Venus seems to have renewed her existence in the representations which are given of her upon the more recent monuments. We see also, in Asiatic Greece, the Goddess Nature revived at Ephesus, Perga, and Samos, where, assuming her ancient form, she contrived to obtain that worship which was refused to her at a subsequent period, in spite of the embellishments she received from Grecian genius. With this view, likewise, Septimius Severus, in his indefatigable and desperate struggle against Christianity, was induced, by a desire to rival the miracles of the Christian religion, to undertake the restoration of the statue of Memnon,\* and, finally, it is thus, that in almost every quarter ancient Polytheism, in its expiring moments, presented the singular spectacle of a simultaneous reappearance, and drew out all its old images, from their dusty receptacles, as the last resort of a worn-out faith! Spectres of customs which had passed away were recalled to a temporary existence, and then consigned to perpetual oblivion!

The climate of Syria is delightful, and not less so that of Phœnicia, (the maritime part of Syria): its sky is blue, like that of India; its sea warm and transparent; the walls of its cities shine like silver; and the sand of its shores glitters with red and purple. A city bearing the name of Eden, and rivers called Lycus, Belus,† Orontes, Adonis, are still extant. Its trees are the tamarisk, the palm with its white head and its slender and elegant stem, the

\* It is well known that the statue of Memnon was supposed to render harmonious sounds, when touched by the first rays of the sun. This colossal monument, whose height was forty-eight feet, without reckoning the pedestal, which was twelve, and the throne upon which it was seated, which was fourteen feet high, was situated in that quarter of the tombs denominated by the Egyptians *Memnonia*. The Greeks, profiting by the resemblance of names, metamorphized *Aménophis* into *Memnon*, giving every morning a vocal salutation to *Aurora*, his mother. It was broken about the year 27 before Christ, by an earthquake, and restored by Septimius Severus, who wished to make use of it as a weapon against Christianity. With what enchanting harmony must the son of Aurora, at one time, have ravished the ears of the numberless pilgrims, who assembled from all quarters, to hear his divine accents, since even in his mutilated state he still rendered sounds of so much sweetness—what resource would Christianity be able to oppose to this wonderful display of God-like power? Vain was the hope! The deity remained silenced for ever more, the prodigy had ceased with the causes which had produced it; it is proved by geological observation, that cracks in granite will emit, under certain atmospheric circumstances, sounds more or less sonorous at sun-rise. In the quarries of Syene, in the Pyrenees, in the granite rocks which border the Oronoko, similar sounds have been observed;—the sighs of the fabulous son of Aurora were of this nature alone, and ceased to be heard when masses of stone had been placed upon the cracked fragments which produced them.

† Belus, a river of Syria, falls into the Mediterranean near Ptolemais. It abounds in sand fit for the manufacture of glass; and it was there that glass was first invented.—*Plin.* v. c. 19, l. 36, c. 26.

*caroubier*, with its bronzed foliage, and its trunk of polished brown, and the sycamore with its branches like a vast parasol, forming a convenient shelter from the sun, whose fervid rays gild the clustered blossoms of the nopal and the perfumed fruits of the orange and banana. Its snow-clad mountains are darkened with the cedar; and its valleys, where graze the hind and the gazelle, are carpetted with anemonies, and planted with lemon-trees, pomegranates, figs, mulberries, masticks, and rhododendrons. Their cities are Tyre, Antioch, Palmyra, Emese, Heliopolis, Helbon, Damascus, Sidon, Ptolemais, &c. &c. Antioch, Aradus,\* Berytus,† Sidon,‡ Tyre,§ Ptolemais,|| are on the coast; Emese stands on the banks of the Orontes, near Mount Lebanon.¶ The houses are washed by the rapid and crystal waters of that lovely river; the cloudless sky unites the horizon with the summits of Mount Lebanon; and when the morn tints its snows with a thousand beautiful colours, it is impossible for the eye to determine, in the uncertain distance, the boundaries either of sky or mountain. At Emese stood that temple dedicated to Halgah-Baal, of which the young Antoninus was high-priest, previous to his becoming emperor. This temple was placed upon a hill, overlooking the city and the river; it commanded a view of the snow-covered tops of Lebanon, the roses of whose valleys filled the air with their delicious perfume; groves of olives, dates, tamarisks, and sycomores, shrouded it with a canopy of verdure, under whose shade sported fawns, antelopes, and hinds; while the lake reflected the light foliage of the trees, and the brilliant azure of the sky. This lake was inhabited by multitudes of fishes of various sizes, white, red, and gold: they were deemed sacred; many were ornamented with collars of pearl, and would come when called by their names. The Cosmogonists of the East affirm, that the world rose out of the waters; an idea which was no doubt derived from a tradition of the Flood. In the midst of the lake stood an altar, which the votaries who offered flowers and incense approached by swimming. The temple faced the East; it had in front an immense court, surrounded by innumerable porticoes and columns, resembling those of Heliopolis (*Balbec*), and Palmyra. In Egypt and in Asia columns are symbolical of the fire and heat of the sun. In the middle of the court were two of those coarse images by which the heathens were wont to express the idea of

\* Founded by Seleucus Nicator.

† Modern *Berut* was the birth-place of Sanchoniatho, the ancient historian of Phœnicia; Byblus (Gebail) was the country of Philo.

‡ Sidon, on whose ruins stands the modern Seide.

§ Tyre, now Sour.

|| Ptolemais (St. Jean d'Acre).

¶ *Lebanon* signifies in the Hebraic language *white*, so called from the perpetual snow on its summit.

re-production. The doors of the temple, its ceiling, and roof, were all of gold—whence breathed the most delicious odours, like unto the perfumes of Arabia. Strains of music and brilliant illuminations were continually added to the delights of this embalmed atmosphere; and three hundred priests, in linen robes, with golden tiaras on their heads, worshipped in a cloud of incense the five deities, *Gad-Baal*, *Baal-Phegor*, *Halgah-Baal*, *Baal-Samen*, *Baal-Zebub*; and the three goddesses, *Baalis-Astarte*, *Baalis-Benoth*, and *Baalis-Derceto*. *Halgah-Baal* was the supreme deity of the temple, and was not represented under any image; one of those rough stones, called Bethels, or Betyles, received in his name the offerings of the Syrians; this stone was black, and of a conical form. *Halgah-Baal* was considered as the great and ineffable god, the sun in his attributes of creator and preserver. *Baal-Phegor* represented the sun in his fertilizing power. *Gad-Baal*, the sun delivering oracles (Phœbus, Apollo). *Baal-Samen*, signifies in the Syrian language the god of day. *Baal-Zebub*, god of those flies which hatch and live in the sun's rays. *Astarte-Baalis* was a golden statue, seated on a throne of gold; she was represented with three heads, each surmounted with a mitre and towers, like those of Cybele, a crown of rays and a crescent; her body was covered by an albe, over which she wore a tunic, and upon that a cape, embroidered in pearls and emeralds with the twelve signs of the Zodiac; a lion stood on each side of her; in her left hand she held a dulcimer, a distaff, and a caduceus; in her right she grasped the thunder; on her arms were carved insects, flowers, fruits, a bow, and a torch. Such was the supreme goddess—the spouse of Halgah-Baal. She represented the moon receiving light from the sun—nature vivified by his beams.\*

\* Those two luminaries, the sun and the moon, are still objects of worship among the Celts—who fall upon their faces and repeat a *Pater* and an *Ave*, when the moon rises.—(*Cambry*, vol. iii. p. 35). In many parts it is styled “our Lady.” Others uncover themselves when the planet Venus appears.—(*Cambry*, vol. i. p. 193.) A solitary stone stands near Morlaix (Department of Finistere-Bretagne) in memorial of the deplorable fate of a peasant, who, as a punishment for blasphemy, was swallowed by the moon; veneration for lakes and fountains is likewise shewn; on certain days are placed near them offerings of butter and of bread.—(*Cambry*, vol. iii. p. 35, also *Depping*, vol. i. p. 76). In the Orcades, even within the last few years, a bride, before her marriage, went to the temple of the moon to invoke Woden.—(*Logan*, ii. 360.) The feast of the sun is still celebrated in a village of Dauphiné, according to Champollion.—(*Figeac on the Dialects of Dauphiné*.) At the fête of St. Jean they assembled to behold the dancing of the rising sun.—(*Rodin, Recherches sur Saumur*.) The inhabitants of the Anjou styled the sun “Lord,” and the moon “Lady.”—(*Rodin, Recherches sur l'Anjou*, i. 86.) All these statements, however, require examination, as they denote superstition of the grossest nature on the part of these people.

The great number of breasts, with which the body of the Ephesian Diana was surrounded (from which she was called *multimammia*, *πολύμαστος*), confirms the opinion of some learned antiquaries, that the *Egyptian Isis*, the *Greek Diana*, the

*Baalis-Benoth* was the Venus of the Latins,—*Baalis Derceto* the Grecian Aphrodite, represented with the tail of a fish, as a symbol of the earth coming out of the waters. All these idols were of gold, and glittering with jewels; their altars were covered with precious offerings from Arabia, Abyssinia, Phœnicia, Cappadocia, and Pontus. The daughters of Emese were wont to advance in a chorus of song, to place garlands of roses and the choicest perfumes of Arabia upon the altars of their divinities. Their priests were habited like women. They carefully plucked every hair from their faces and bodies, and painted their perfumed skins with white and red. Their flowing robes were draped in coquettish folds, and their hands and arms covered with rings and bracelets. They danced before their gods, and chaunted hymns to the sound of triangles and dulcimers, and the virgins of Emese, perfuming their hair with the essence of roses and the Iris, joined in the ceremonies of their temple, and assisted in the celebration of the death and resurrection of Adonis.\*

From this voluptuous worship we may well hasten to purify our thoughts with the truths of a religion which comes home to our reason and to our hearts, and which leads to the conviction that it is our duty to promote the well-being of our fellow creatures. We can prove, that although we recognise the existence of religious systems, which have produced a certain degree of civilization, yet in fact social order made no real progress before the establishment of Christianity. Let us first take philosophy in its highest degree of splendour, when it flowed in clear and mellifluous strains from the lips of Plato; from those of Aristotle, dry and pedantic; Pythagoras, the superstitious dreamer, and very far inferior to the disciple of Socrates. Plato, in his theory of ideas, raises philosophy above the powers of man. The logic of Aris-

*Phrygian Rhæa* (from the Hebrew word *Rahah*, “to feed”), the *Syrian Astarte-Baalis*, were the same divinity—all emblems of fecundity. They were also crowned with turrets. It is very observable that almost all the statues of the Ephesian Diana have a crab upon the breast. Montfaucon says the signification is uncertain. Not at all: every one agrees that the representation of the Ephesian Diana was taken from the Egyptian Isis; and all authors, both ancient and modern, affirm that the overflowing of the Nile becomes remarkable generally at the summer solstice. How then could the Egyptians represent fertility better than by placing on the breast of their goddess Isis, or universal nature, that sign in the zodiac, which denotes the summer solstice, when the fertile water of the Nile begins to diffuse plenty over the face of their country? Their fictitious animal the Sphinx (from the Hebrew word *sphang*, signifying overflowing), a figure composed of the body of a lion, and the head of a virgin, denotes plenty spread over Egypt, by the overflowing of the Nile during the time the sun passes through the signs of the lion and virgin, which immediately follow the summer solstice.

\* It is noted by Montfaucon that Moses does not mention any temple of architectural construction. He only made an altar, surrounded with twelve pillars, what we should call a cromlech and stone circle, in the construction of which all hewn stone and iron tools were prohibited.—(*Exod.* xx. ver. 25, xxiv. ver. 4.) Thus Stonehenge is of the most ancient form of temple.



tole exalts mankind above philosophy. The civilization of Greece owed to these men the three elements of faith, reasoning and revelation, answering amongst the Hebrews, to Moses, the Pharisees, and Jesus Christ. Plato was never comprehended by the ancients; Christianity was required in order to render him intelligible; his genius which soared so high in the regions of dogma and theurgy, did in fact, in a mysterious manner, designate the Trinity; he admits a Being infinite, absolute, and uncontrouled, from which emanates the word (*λογος*). From that essence which he elsewhere styles the Son (*υιος*), proceeds the soul (*ψυχη*). These ideas are vague, obscure, and undefined, and emanate from an imperfect knowledge of an original and primitive system, affording powerful evidence, that the human soul, in its attempts to soar to a higher world, and purify itself by a contemplation of Deity, resembles those old pictures which dipped in acids regain their freshness and their original colour. Christianity enlightens our conceptions of God, and through faith renders him accessible to all. He becomes palpable to the affections. The law of his nature, mysterious and incomprehensible as it is, is revealed in the creation—that is to say, by the manner in which he operates upon the world and upon human nature. God beams upon our souls and stamps his own image upon us, as an artist on the work of his own hands. If God had not given us a threefold capacity, and endued us with physical, moral, and intellectual functions, united in one whole or individual, it would have been impossible for us to have comprehended his nature; one being can have no knowledge of another, unless they both possess some common property. The God of the Christians is a great intellectual and moral Being, whose essence is universal love and benevolence. The ancients could only discern this principle through indistinct traditions; a spiritual and occult cause can only be appreciated by its operations; nor was it in the power of the scholastic philosophy to discover and comprehend it. Aristotle goes by rule: his metaphysics, which consisted of syllogisms, start from too low a point to obtain a full view of such a subject. According to his theory, man is the productive element of morals and science; he disengages an idea from his mind, and gives it currency by the power of speech. His system rests upon natural and human impulse. Christianity, on the contrary, has a more exalted source, and teaches us that reason is revealed to the mind of man, and that all is the result of one great spiritual Cause, whose diffusive and infinite power presides over all. God is the soul of our reason, the light of our intelligent nature, and the centre of our affections. This is the sublime theory contained in the sacred volume. Viewed in connexion with this first, sole, and independ-

ent cause, let the world and animated nature be studied and analyzed in all their ramifications, and let the perfect law of love be adored in all its inspiring emanations. Christian metaphysics enlighten and purify the understanding, resembling those "tongues of fire" which rested on the heads of the disciples of Christ.

The primitive Christians testified the utmost contempt for the philosophy of the schools. The Bible contained in their estimation every species of knowledge which could be useful to mankind, although in a brief and concentrated form. They preferred gathering the ripe fruits of this soul-strengthening and life-giving tree, to throwing away their time in useless speculations on the nature of the soul, the origin of ideas, and the theory of morals. In constant contact, however, with the Pagans, they were compelled to enter the arena of polemics, and to use the same weapons as their antagonists. Philosophy, therefore, became to them an arsenal from which they drew those weapons that could be rendered serviceable in the defence of Christianity, and by which they were not only able to sustain with advantage the assaults of the ancient logic, but to become in their turn the assailants, and drive the enemy from his stronghold. This distinction then existed between the philosophy of the Gentiles, and that of the Christian; the one was the constant disputant in religion, whilst the other acted as its guardian. A philosophical school was placed near the temples of the Christians, as a sentinel is posted at the gates of a palace: and this proves that Christianity could bear the closest investigation. Aristotle, to the astonishment of all, appears to have laboured for the Son of Mary. The Scriptures afford a key to the writings of Plato; the convictions of faith sustain the attacks of reason, like a giant wielding with one hand both sword and buckler.

This alliance, however, gave birth to interminable controversy. The middle ages confounded the form with the substance, and a curious coincidence in the opinions of Socrates with those of the Fathers, caused human reason to be considered all powerful, and led by a rapid descent to the doctrine of Eclecticism, which gleaned indiscriminately from the words of man and those of God. What was most wanting in the science of morals among the ancients was universality and the stamp of high authority; it was man quoting the opinions of his fellow mortal, and the insufficiency of unassisted powers was constantly rendered manifest. Pythagoras collected together all those primitive ideas which the memory of man had retained, but to form them into a system he was obliged to have recourse to dogmas of his own invention. Jesus Christ opens and displays before all mankind the book of his life, he places example before precept, his acts bear testimony to his

preaching, and the man bears witness of his divinity; his tenets are divine, for love itself speaks by his mouth; divine are also his works, for they stamp a sanction on his precepts. The Gospel penetrates into the inmost heart, and by its persuasive accents leads to the practice of virtue; it extends the mantle of charity to those who suffer by hunger and cold; it abases the proud, and succours those who pine in captivity. Oh, how strange in this world of opulence and traffic sound the words of Jesus "Blessed are the poor." That the tenets of Christ are divine, is fully proved by the impossibility of so perfect a system being drawn from ideas which are hostile to liberty, to charity, and to philanthropy.

With the advance in human intellect, the Jewish people had without doubt made a much greater progress in religious knowledge than the surrounding nations. In lieu of family gods, their legislator had opened to them the knowledge of a supreme Being, the sole Ruler of the universe. The disciples of the law of Moses believe that in some future age all nations will be merged in one, and that it will be brought about by means of an united sentiment of awe, of love, and of reverence towards one common Master. Thus the doctrine of the unity, at which the Grecian philosophy arrived after immense labour, forms the basis of the Jewish religion. Those tenets which, from the lips of Socrates, express nothing more than a plan of social organization without any rational aim, and the denial of a false creed, became in the hands of Moses the moving principle of a new system, and the foundation of a new belief.

Such was the wonderful chain of events.—Rome by her conquests imposing an universal language, had prepared all nations to receive one common instruction. The Greeks had demonstrated by their proceedings the absurdity of Polytheism, and had demolished by degrees the whole of the Homeric Olympus. Then were the conceptions of Moses first brought into action, and at a subsequent period Christ himself appears to finish the work. He calls upon all mankind as brethren, on the Gentiles and on the descendants of Abraham, proclaiming the doctrine of the unity, which confounds all distinctions of the human race in love and reverence of the one universal God, and which he sealed with his blood. It would require volumes to enumerate the effects of Christianity on liberty, and on civilization, and the improvement of men and nations; all the elements of society are derived from it; the progressive advancement made since the fall of the Roman empire has Christianity for its basis or centre. It is the moving spirit which presides over every event, and directs its influence on the future. Let us not then expect

to find true philosophy unassociated with Christianity; or at least, let us acknowledge its sublime principles, as the germs of the progress of the human intellect, in the arts, the sciences, and in industry; principles which the Christian Church has through a series of ages infused into the whole of our intellectual nature. What *chefs-d'œuvre* of art has Christianity given birth to! What deep and powerful feelings has it raised in the imagination of the artist! Michael Angelo felt in his inmost soul the immensity of Deity, when his mighty genius displayed itself in the magnificent structure of St. Peter's—Raphael has shed rays of divine lustre on the heads of his Madonnas. Correggio has thrown into his canvas a flood of celestial light and beauty in the heads of his angels, and the countenances of his Virgins. Those sublime and majestic strains which were poured forth by Handel, Pergolesi, Haydn, Mozart, and Cherubini, owe their existence to the same inspiring cause. Had not their souls been filled with divine ideas and Christian sentiments, their music would not have been what it is, capable of elevating the heart, and conveying to the soul those secret raptures which raise it to the contemplation of its God. Sacred music is both edifying and consolatory. It withdraws the thoughts from this world of misery and suffering, and transports us to a higher sphere. It produces a holy abstraction from earthly things, and raises our ideas to a celestial abode. It is to the same high and exalted feelings which have been engendered by Christianity that we owe those beautiful and splendid edifices, the cathedrals of Europe, which are suspended over our cities, and are the visible types of our religion, resembling it at once by their vastness and simplicity of design; and their minuteness and complexity of detail. How grand are the effects of that brilliant variety of colours displayed in their casements; through whose variegated panes the radiance of the sun produces a bright assemblage of rubies, emeralds, and starry wheels, which appear to revolve like those of the car of Elijah. In these majestic temples of the 14th century, the mind of man finds space to dilate itself; and in contemplating the lofty nave, his thoughts soar upwards and ascend to Heaven. Where are there to be found structures of similar character, and so fitted for duration, among the master-pieces of antiquity? These churches with their low pillars, secluded aisles, and dark masses of stone, have an air of mystery, grandeur and solemnity, which is vainly sought for in the finest edifices of more modern eras.

Those men of the olden time arranged the stone, handled the pencil and the pen with the fervour of religious feeling; their devotion aided their work; their verses dropt piously and simply from their lips, like the beads of a rosary. Christianity pervaded the

air in those days, and was inhaled with the breath of life.\* One species of production was wanting, even during the most religious eras, and that is, a history of the advancement of Christian knowledge, in a style as exalted as its subject. The chroniclers of the middle ages existed under the influence of the Latin authors. Sallust, Tacitus, and especially Livy, were the guides they imitated. Bossuet produced a voluminous work upon the sacred history of antiquity, but he touched upon that of modern times in a very superficial manner. The advent of Christ was not only an act of the divine nature, it was also a most important link in the chain of human events. If we take the world as it was under the dominion of the Romans, we find traditionary facts, distorted by error and corruption. If we contemplate the forests and steppes of the north, menacing the incursion of an overwhelming torrent of barbarians, and the brutal and selfish ignorance of the multitude, brought into contact with the misguided errors of Rome—what would have been the result? An endless perpetuity and increase of ignorance and blindness, terminating in utter darkness.

It was necessary then to the existence of the civilized world, that the Roman empire should be the depository of a germ of life and light, in order that in the great amalgamation of nations which afterwards ensued, barbarism should become softened down by civilization, and ignorance yield to truth. The Roman empire was on the wane, and with it the influence which it exercised over the minds of the mass of mankind. At this juncture Christianity stepped in, and preserved society from falling into a state of utter dissolution. If we interrogate the past, before we anticipate the events of the future, and refer to former facts, coupling each occurrence with those which preceded and succeeded it, we shall have a key to this wonderful dispensation.

From the era of Calvary, mankind classed themselves under two denominations, the Christian and the Jew. The one, invested with the law of love, and the means of religious improvement, marched with firm and confident step towards his high destiny; the other, branded on the forehead with a bloody stain, roams, like a second Cain, over the world, a mere animated corpse, possessing neither motion, impulse nor spirit, to pursue the path of knowledge; floating about as chance may lead, to vegetate like

\* The predominant expression visible on all the productions of Paganism, is that of physical qualities, as more adapted to a society based upon animal powers. Thus the admirable *Venus* represented sensual love, corporeal beauty, and fertility of nature. The *Apollo* and *Bacchus* were likewise types of bodily endowments. *Diana with the Fawn*, and the *Gladiator*, were symbols of activity, *Jupiter* and *Hercules*, models of physical power. Modern art, on the contrary, has comprehended, felt, and expressed the more intellectual and spiritual elements of human nature.

seed borne upon the wind. To the Christian was promised a progressive advance towards a futurity of everlasting happiness; he was exhorted to rely upon God's mercy and providence, and was guarded by that sustaining arm, to seek for brethren beyond the polar seas, and within the torrid zone; and to bear to each extremity of the earth's surface, the blessed doctrines of liberty of conscience and of person. The fetters drop from the hands of the slave! No longer shall he be the property of his fellow man: he is the child of God! The sentence pronounced upon the Jew, and its accomplishment in this world, is universally known. Both Jew and Christian afford equal testimony to the truth of Christianity; the one by the duration of his punishment, the other by a merciful system of pardon and deliverance.

Since that period, empires have been overthrown: nation has risen up against nation, and creeds have been swept from the face of the earth. Two alone remain as they originally were, the Christian and the Jew. Pagan Rome was never reformed by Christianity. One system can never be superseded by another without being entirely demolished; to do this was the mission of the barbarians: all Europe was in conflagration; it seemed as though Etna had opened her crater, to pour forth men. A torrent of barbarians overflow the country, and commit unheard-of ravages—the Roman world falls prostrate, and soon becomes a heap of ruins, but over these ruins is erected a Cross! Behold the miracle produced by Christianity; the world would have ended, had not her principles been those of life. Had the barbarians remained unambitious in their native forests, Rome, dissolute and voluptuous, had slept the sleep of death and of annihilation. One error would have given place to another, nor could there have arisen knowledge, virtue, wisdom or social improvement. We shall trace no further the effects of Christianity upon the moral progress of the middle ages. This important subject would require a separate article. It is enough for us to have established the fact, that it was through the intervention of Christianity, that the civilized world was rescued from barbarism, and we repeat, that the whole human race would have been sunk in one common abyss of destruction had not its natural energies been aided by Christian principles. In the two following centuries, by their aid, a prodigious advance was made by the barbarians in civilization. Christianity was the originator and guide in every step that was taken.\* Christianity, when properly apprehended, embraces the whole of man; it penetrates the very depths

\* The philosophers of the last century, with Voltaire at their head, took a fancy to constitute themselves the panegyrist of the Emperor Julian, the apostate restorer of an erroneous, worn-out creed, which had been proved by experience to be destitute of

of our souls, and imbues the nature of our being. By means of the productions of industry, it finds access to the outward senses; through the medium of the sciences, it addresses man's intellectual faculties; and by means of the fine arts, it speaks to his feelings; and eventually engenders the faith which is the result of conviction. The doctrine of the Gospel is love! Christianity blends mankind together, and unites all human beings with their God. Truth reaches all understandings, Charity all hearts. Powerful union, in which all individuality is lost! Noble alliance, whose members unite themselves in one great body! This unanimity increases from age to age, and will be the great law of future times, when Christianity shall have performed its ultimate work.

The middle ages were only outwardly religious. The age of Louis XIV., who considered a massacre of the Protestants the readiest way to ensure his own salvation,\* if it believed at all, denied its creed by its actions. The present era has too much of speculation and theory. Liberty of opinion, equal participation in divine things, and universal charity, are the fundamental principles of the New Testament. Extend thyself, O Christian World! let thy benign influence spread over the sea and land, uniting all mankind in one bond of love, to the Lord Jesus

those vital principles necessary for the improvement and prosperity of mankind. These insensate plaudits of the philosophers are so many outrages upon the social order and improvement of the human race. In rejecting Christianity, which is productive of every social good, Julian, whose education had been in the school of adversity, (not always sufficient to form the minds of princes), mistook entirely the necessities of his own era, and the interest and well-being of mankind.

\* Can we call that an age of faith in the precepts of Christ, can we entertain the faintest idea of the principles of Christianity, when it is impossible to form a just calculation of the number of Christians immolated by the intendants, governors, and other executioners of the *Edict of Revocation*, in the Cevennes, on the gibbets erected by order of the Abbé de Cayla, and of those whose limbs were broken in the Ceps, (a new instrument of torture, invented by that chief of the missionaries in Languedoc, at his chateau of *Mont Vert*).

In submitting himself to the double tutelage of the Jesuit Letellier, and of Madame de Maintenon, Louis XIV. was persuaded to sign that edict of Revocation, ruining France by the emigration of 40,000 manufacturers and workmen, who carried into Germany, Holland, and England, their capital and their industry. (Hence the origin of the silk trade in Spitalfields.) The exasperation of Louis against the Protestants was as cruel and impolitic as it was unjust. The persecution of the Jansenists would only have been ridiculous, had it not been accompanied by 8,000 *lettres-de-cachet*. His having twice ravaged the Palatinate by fire; his persecution of Fenélon; the gallantries and ruinous follies of Versailles, where the "Grand Monarque" figured as Roger and the Sun at the same time; that singular succession of concubines at court even during the lifetime of the Queen, one of whom, Mademoiselle de Fontanges, squandered upon her toilet 100,000 crowns per month, sufficiently prove our assertions (respecting "le grand Siècle.") See Letters of Madame de Sevigné, 1674, of September or December, on the subject of the hangings in Brittany, of which she speaks with a degree of levity which shows the spirit of the age, or rather, we should say, that of the court.

Christ; thus shall the entire universe become one great family, "in one fold, and under one Shepherd," holding all things in common, and for the benefit of mankind at large. The expanding charity of Christ can alone work out this prodigy, since it is he alone who has said, Ye are brethren.

We cannot conclude our article without offering to Dr. Russell, the learned author of the *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*, our tribute of admiration, and, which will assuredly be felt by every one of his readers capable of appreciating him, at the vast erudition displayed in his work, as well as at the extent and variety of his researches, and the force and clearness of his reasonings.

It has been said of the celebrated Michaelis, that he had found in preceding commentaries on the Bible, and in the different branches of theology which form their ground-work, rude and misshapen materials, with which he had succeeded in building up a solid and regular edifice, capable of being adapted to every subsequent expansion which new wants might create, or a new state of things might render necessary or desirable. It is precisely of this sort of expansion of which the work of Dr. Russell, now before us, affords a beautiful specimen. In this indeed consists its chief value. The mode in which he has treated the subject changes the face of those sciences which are connected with the exposition and interpretation of the sacred traditions; and this it does, not by shaking their foundation or perverting their object, but by throwing upon them that light which the author has derived from his profound knowledge of the history and civilization of the East, and his acquaintance with those languages akin to the Hebrew tongue, and with the arts and industry of the nations brought into contact with the Jews, aided by judicious and philosophical criticism, full of those ingenious combinations which give so much value to isolated facts, such as would be otherwise barren and devoid of interest.

The views entertained by this learned writer respecting the manners, customs, arts, knowledge, industry, trade, monuments, laws, and institutions of the Jews, and the various phases of their destiny, as well as their relations with other ancient countries, are explained with clearness and order in a series of chapters, which together form a valuable body of scriptural archæology.

It would be difficult to praise too much the sagacity of his conjectures, or the originality of his views, or the felicity with which Dr. Russell explains and interprets a variety of points which have been hitherto buried in obscurity, or have been neglected as unimportant in the history of the nations of antiquity by the almost innumerable host of commentators who have preceded him.



The time, labour, patience, perseverance, learning, and penetration which such a work requires, are almost incalculable. The examination of texts, the references to ancient works, the collation of manuscripts; the critical study of both Testaments in connection with profane history, the comparative ages and values of different editions, their relations to each, the authority and fidelity of the versions of different times and in different languages, the inquiry into the authenticity of certain parts of the canonical books, the moral and literary appreciation of all the monuments and documents which are capable of throwing any light upon the past or present state of the sacred and profane texts, or upon the nature and origin of those changes which time or other causes may have introduced into them;—all these various forms of investigation and labour must certainly have occupied a very large share of the time and attention of the author, during a long series of years.

Yet the perusal of the work occasions us to regret that the learned author has not given us a more complete view of the religious systems of India; that he has not, for instance, entered more largely into the schism of *Buddha*, and its effects upon the state of that part of the world. Originating in India, the religion of *Buddha*, which rallies to its tenets about three hundred millions of sectarians, spread itself to the North and to the East among the Tartar and the Gothic nations, who were the barbarians of the Chinese world, as the Huns and Vandals were the barbarians of the Roman world, and gave birth to the *Lamaism* established in Thibet. In a country of castes and exclusion, this religion has had the effect of destroying castes. It proclaimed that all were equally under the protection of the Deity. Persecuted by the Brahmins, Buddhism has enjoyed the glory of martyrdom, having set the seal of its blood to the benevolence of its creed. There is scarcely a Christian virtue which it has not preached. It enforces not only humility and charity, but likewise the subjugation of the sensual desires. Its morality embraces lofty and extended views, in which one may recognize an almost evangelical purity and excellence. The love which overflows and extends itself beyond the ordinary limits of humanity—even to plants and animals, and breathes the sweet savour of a tender pity, pervades this religion in a remarkable manner.\* It was favourably received, and indeed, eagerly embraced in China, where, perhaps, it was necessary in order to withstand the natural inclinations of a people enslaved by their appetites and their material interests.

\* *Do not light the lamps for fear of the butterflies*, is a sentiment replete with feeling, and which at once goes to the heart.—See the book on *Rewards and Punishments*, translated by M. Remusat. Paris. Firmin Didot.

Buddhism might almost be designated the Christianity of the East; imperfect and incomplete, no doubt, but still wonderful and admirable, as far as it went. This is so true, that in no heathen countries has Christianity been planted with greater success than in those where Buddhism had previously prevailed. Buddhism seems to have moistened and softened the soil, and disposed it to be fruitful, whereas Brahminism and Islamism scorched and dried it up.

There appears to be a remarkable distinction in the general character of the East and the West. The East invents and preserves, the West applies and improves. Languages, religion, sciences, arts, games, have all originated in the East;\* but there are none that we have not adopted and improved upon. To enlarge and perfect seems to be the genius of the West. The East may be likened to a vast pacific ocean, and the West to a river which flows from and is maintained by it, but which widens and deepens as it proceeds; and notwithstanding turnings and windings, and occasional checks, its fertilising waters roll onwards, diffusing plenty in their course over the face of remotest regions.

We could have wished that Dr. Russell had favoured us with a map of ancient and modern geography. Such a map, embodying all that is ascertained by the investigations of recent travellers, and illustrated as it would have been by the text, would have given additional value to the work. Notwithstanding, however, these points, the volumes of Dr. Russell contain a complete treasury of facts, traditions, materials, and discussions, which are compactly and ably embodied by the skill and judgment of the author, and, as such, are worthy of being in the hands, not only of churchmen and theologians, but of all who are desirous that their views and convictions upon this very important subject should be grounded upon a conscientious and deep inquiry into it.

---

\* The manufacture of silk and porcelain, the art of dying, the composition of ink, the engraving on metals, on wood and stone, the inventions of the compass, printing, clocks, signs, paper-money, gunpowder, playing cards, and chess, are all derived from the East.

ART. VI.—*M. Cousin's Report on the State of Education in Holland, translated by Mr. Horner. 1838.*

THE few pages, which we now submit to our readers, are to be considered as a mere sequel or postscript to former observations, spread through several numbers of the *British Critic*; and, as there are cogent reasons why we should abstain from offering opinions which are liable to controversy, we shall content ourselves with some brief and simple statements, which recent circumstances seem to require at our hands.

We have heard, with the liveliest satisfaction, that there is an immediate intention to establish, under very high auspices in the Church, Middle or Intermediate Schools between the Proprietary Schools in connection with King's College, and Parochial Schools in connection with the National Society. It is probable that, in the interval which must occur between the writing and the publication of these sentences, some Prospectus will be put forth, or some active step will be taken. But it is also probable, that, even if we waited, we should have no time left for any accurate examination of the specific plan; and it may be better on other accounts, that, *before* and *without* any positive acquaintance with it, we should give at once our own independent views upon the subject.

Yet we need not say "*should give.*" We have already given them, again and again. And, therefore, it is not too much to assert, that we take in any such scheme a strong and almost parental solicitude; since for four years, at the very least, it has been near our hearts and upon our minds. A few extracts from our former disquisitions will place the matter beyond a doubt.

In an article, written in the year 1834, and published on the *first of January, 1835*, upon "*The Progress of Popular Education in France and England,*" we had been speaking both of the instruction afforded to the poor, and also of the foundations which had been laid for the solid and ornamental education of the higher ranks, and the improvements which were taking place, with a generous spirit of rivalry, in our public schools and universities; and we then added—

"There is, however, another class, of which the position is not so favourable. We mean the class which is situated between the higher and middle ranks, on the one side; and, on the other, the persons who, for themselves or their children, enjoy the benefit of national and parochial schools—the class, for instance, composed of petty dealers and shopkeepers in towns, and small farmers in the country. We really

think that, at the present actual state of progress, this class will soon be less provided with the means of valuable education, than the classes which are below them. They are above the sphere in which mere charity revolves; and yet their circumstances will not allow them to take advantage of the London University, King's College, and the schools in connection with those institutions; while the private seminaries, to which their children can be sent, have oftentimes no other recommendation than a correspondence with the limits of their income. If, in addition to reading and writing, the elements of history, geography, natural philosophy, mathematics and music—to say nothing of 'logical exercises,' 'the arts of painting and design,' and other proposed additions—are to constitute the *minimum* of instruction in a good national school, the child, whether male or female, will there very soon receive a better education, both in quantity and quality, than the child of parents somewhat more elevated in the social scale. Even now, if examined as to religious knowledge, as before the ceremony of confirmation, the former has for the most part a manifest superiority over the latter.

"Here, then, is a gap. Here there *may* be a derangement of the social system. Here is a field of benevolent exertion, wide, and almost unoccupied. Here the clergy, and the other influential members of the Church, may originate a design of vast utility, and take the initiative part. Here Lord Brougham cannot step forward, like Coriolanus, and say "*Alone I did it*;" nor can the Dissenters assert that they were foremost in the field, although it is remarkable that the chief strength of the Dissenters, particularly the Wesleyan Methodists, lies in the very class which we have pointed out. All, perhaps, that is necessary, will be to give an impetus, and set the wheels in motion. The parties most concerned will then bestir themselves for their own profit. It is not required to do all for them, but rather to put them in the way of helping and benefiting themselves; of combining and co-operating to exalt the character of the education communicated to their children; and establishing, perhaps, other proprietary schools, cheaper, more commercial, and more practical, than those which are already at work. We shall not now venture to propose any specific plan; but in treating of the social improvements, to which Christians should address themselves, we may seize an opportunity of recurring to the subject."—*British Critic*, No. XXXIII. pp. 70, 71.

On the 1st of January, 1836, we returned to the charge. In an article headed, "*How is the Church to be saved?*" and containing, if we may venture on the prophecy, some other suggestions which will yet bear fruit, our language was, after a notice of parochial and elementary education,—

"But this is not all. Education upon Church principles must at least be universal among Churchmen. We need scarcely allege, that the education of the Clergy themselves must be lifted up to the highest attainable pitch of solidity, and comprehensiveness, and spirituality. We would speak of all classes and all ranks. Assuredly, so long as the

Church itself is dominant, an education, not dissevered from the Church, must be dominant in our public schools and universities, and be so framed as to have a real and lasting dominion. Assuredly, it is a sacred obligation, interwoven with the very being of true Churchmen, that their sons and daughters should be educated, whether at home or abroad, in a reverential attachment to the Church, and in a correct acquaintance with its tenets and ordinances. Assuredly, too, something *must* be done with respect to persons whom we have already mentioned. We allude to the children of the humble tradesman, to the lower division of the middle order. Seminaries must be formed under the auspices of the Church in the interval, still gaping and yawning wide, between parochial and proprietary schools, between merely charitable foundations and such institutions as King's College. Otherwise, this class of the people, perhaps the most numerous, and certainly not the least active, will be more and more alienated from the Church, and either left to education in Dissent, or abandoned to a method of instruction, for the most part, quite impotent and quite miserable."—*Ibid.* No. XXXVII. p. 38.

In the April of the same year, we struck the same chord *again*. Then, in the very next number of this Review, we took a general but rapid survey of the "*Prospects of National Education*;" and we declared;—

"When we would strike the general balance, there is a vast preponderance on the side of peril and difficulty. Let us *suppose* the upper classes safe; let us suppose them placed above the influence of that intellectual and moral contagion, which floats in the atmosphere of ignorance or false knowledge; let us *suppose*—and the supposition is even now a violent one—that adequate provision is made for the mental and spiritual wants of the humblest ranks among us:—still there remains the mighty chasm between—no, not chasm—but the mighty space filled up by a teeming population of busy myriads. *With* these myriads, and *for* these myriads, something must be done."—*Ibid.* No. XXXVIII. p. 475.

At pages 476, 477, we entered more into particulars, and then subjoined:—

"But already, *months and even years ago*, on more than one or two occasions, we have insisted upon the necessity of making strenuous efforts, as Christians and as Churchmen, for the education and subsequent instruction of the less opulent division of the middle ranks. Instead, therefore, of repeating our own opinions, *usque ad nauseam*, we rejoice to avail ourselves of the authority of Mr. Short, fully concurring in the general tenor of the extract which we subjoin, though not, perhaps, in every single observation."—*Ibid.* No. XXXVIII. p. 477.

The present rector of Bloomsbury proposed, "that a class of schools should be established in London, and other large towns, for the middle orders, such as the superior mechanic and the little tradesman, which should be carried on upon the system of mutual instruction, but in which much higher branches of educa-

tion might be introduced." "It can hardly be doubted," said Dr. Short, "that a large number of scholars might be procured at such a school, who would willingly pay at the rate of one shilling a week." Our own sentiments were thus summed up at the conclusion of the article.

"With all respect, then, be it said, that the members of the Church of England, and more especially the more exalted and influential members, must now, having first scanned the actual position of the empire, adapt themselves and their efforts to the new circumstances which have arisen; they must enter upon a bolder and more vigorous policy than they have hitherto pursued; they must act upon a larger and broader scale of operations; they must assume, we are unwilling to say a more aggressive, but a more active, and energetic, and conspicuous part. It is strange that we must tell Christians not to be too tranquil and too unostentatious, as if troublesomeness and ostentation could ever become virtues: but, in deed and in truth, they must "let their light shine;" or it may be extinguished. We are far from meaning that they should signalize themselves amidst the violence of controversy, and the strife of factions; but they must be *seen* to be foremost in all sacred enterprises; and what they do in the cause of spiritual instruction, of religious and useful education, of moral knowledge and enlightenment, of general amelioration and philanthropy, they must have the *credit* of doing. From principle, rather than from indolence, they have been fond of remaining in the back ground. The times demand that they should step into the front. They must be prominent. They must take the lead. Otherwise, amidst the countless projects of the day, and the restless officiousness of busy men, their merits may be unregarded, their influence may die away, their very existence may be left out of the account. They must bestir themselves; proceeding, however, by matured and well-digested schemes; not by rash measures, which may help to dismember instead of strengthening the Church, and where the remedy would be almost as grievous as the distemper. They must bestir themselves chiefly in two ways,—

"1st. By providing a directly religious instruction for the entire people, through the regular ministration of the Clergy in the parish or district, and in the consecrated place of worship, with an instrumentality commensurate with the exigencies of the land.

"2ndly. By labouring that there may be a good solid education, founded upon religion, and not disconnected from the Church, for all who need it; but especially for the less wealthy members of the middle order, both male and female:—thus helping to do for *la petite bourgeoisie* what has already been done for themselves by *la bourgeoisie supérieure*.

"These plans, separately so essential, have yet an intimate affinity: they will produce a tenfold benefit, if undertaken in conjunction; and, in fact, we can hardly hope that the due results will be attained, if there be only one without the other."—*Ibid.* p. 481.

And so we went on, almost from that time to the present, in

a number of passages, which may be easily adduced, if ever their evidence should be demanded.

But enough of quotation from ourselves. It would not be fair, in any way, to inflict more of the same matter again upon the same readers. We would only refer them to an article on "*Social Improvement in connection with the Church*," and also to another, in No. XLIV., headed, "*Sermon of the Bishop of Norwich—Education and Government*," for remarks on some incidental points connected with the main question before us, and tending to prove that we do not here introduce any new matter, but simply bring forward our previous statements as witnesses of feelings and opinions long ago entertained.

True it is, that we may not have any article to show, expressly devoted to this subject and no other. No; but why? Simply because there was nothing in existence, as far as we could discover, no English work except Dr. Short's brief pamphlet, and no English institution whatever, on which a direct article could be founded. We were always obliged to bring the matter into notice almost by violence; for the difficulty was, and the difficulty is still, that we could not find any peg on which to hang our observations.

These details may seem unnecessary; but we deem it right to go into them, not out of disrespect or dislike to any person or class of persons, but for the sake of the credit and honour of the members of our own communion. The question of education is called, and not without reason, "*the question of questions*:" the press swarms with educational projects, and many of these are mixed up with principles, which it is impossible for Churchmen consistently and conscientiously to recognize. The friends and the opponents of the Ecclesiastical Establishment are running a race of not altogether ignoble or unprofitable competition. But then it becomes well to recur to the simple evidence of dates; because much must depend upon priority in point of time. It is a very different thing, for instance, whether the plan of middle schools occupied the attention of Churchmen, so much earlier, or so much later; whether it was *actually promulgated* by them more than three years ago, or only in the present season; in the beginning of the year 1835, or only in the spring of the year 1838. For, in the first publication of the *Central Society of Education*, there is a note at page 59, in which it is stated, "We shall have occasion to publish evidence *at some future time* which will show that the schools for the trading and mercantile classes are very frequently mere *Ergastula*, to which boys are sent out of the way to be boarded and birched at 20*l.* a year." "We live at a time when the political importance of the humbler ranks

of the middle classes is rapidly increasing, and when the success of our national industry is as rapidly augmenting their wealth and their luxuries; but a large proportion of this very class is allowed to waste the only leisure period of a life of business in the worst establishments, professing to be establishments for education at all, which are to be found in Europe." It is said, likewise, in a paper on the Elementary Schools of Prussia, "at that period (up to the year 1770,) the elementary schools for the poorer classes were in a very low condition, which was the more to be regretted, as the immense distance between elementary and grammar schools was not then filled up by any of those middle schools, which at present afford the appropriate degree of instruction to such a large class of society." Such things happened, we are told, when "the whole system of education in Prussia was in no way superior to that adopted in England, nor was it materially of another character."

Now, if it could be made out that the Church-scheme only appeared *after* the date of that publication, we are quite certain that the old and impudent cry would be repeated, that English Churchmen were quite incompetent to frame for themselves any original conceptions; that they could only copy the ideas of more liberal and comprehensive thinkers; that they were still going upon the old tack, of first resisting plans, and then imitating or borrowing them when they could no longer be resisted; and that this scheme of middle schools no more appertained to any Churchman alive than to the man in the moon.

But if we can show beyond possibility of denial or misconception, that this plan was propounded by Churchmen *before* the date of Mr. Wyse's lucubrations, and before the birth of this Central Society;—if we can show that the same ground had been previously taken, that the same defects had been previously observed, and that similar remedies for them had been previously suggested; all these cavils, at least in the present instance, fall and crumble into the dust. This, however, must be shown by some clear and tangible manifesto;—by something, in a word, written, printed, and published; since, in such a case, private meditations will go for nothing, and *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*.

With respect, likewise, to persons of a very different stamp, there may be considerable use in ascertaining and declaring how the case really stands. For to pretend that this subject had been altogether disregarded, or that it had not been seen in the full magnitude of its positive and relative importance; or that it was necessary for any gentleman, however respectable, belonging to any other communion, to press it upon the Anglican



Church, would be a complete mistake. The fact must be now apparent; we have ourselves mentioned it, not once, not unadvisedly, not incidentally, not lightly; but often, but deliberately, but earnestly, and as a matter of the gravest moment. We have given it its due prominence. We have done all that was in our power to place it and to keep it before the public eye. Not only we were not blind to the deficiency; not only we saw the gap and lamented it; not only we put our hand on that exact spot in the body politic; but we pressed the point till we were half ashamed of the importunate iteration, and feared that, without exhausting the subject, we had worn it threadbare. As to actual operations, we wished, of course, that the initiative steps should be taken by persons of far more weight and authority than ourselves; because we felt that, without their sanction and co-operation, such a design, after all, if attempted on any large scale, would prove, and perhaps ought to prove, abortive; and because it is a mere truism to remark, that of all projects in which the Church is immediately and deeply concerned the heads of the Church ought to be at the head. But, while it was not for us to take the lead in the practical undertaking, it seemed a duty incumbent upon us, in our mere connection with ecclesiastical literature, to familiarize the popular mind with the conception. We thought that this conception originated with ourselves; if we had thought otherwise we should have stated without disguise the source from which we derived it. This, at least, we can positively affirm, that, whether our recommendation of Middle Schools was or was not, anterior to others in point of time, it was made as the offspring of our own minds, and without any previous communication from any person in existence.

But let us be understood. We do not mean to arrogate an exclusive originality to ourselves, and so make a covert charge of plagiarism against others. The mere insinuation of such a charge would be invidious and, we doubt not, unfair. The *hiatus* must have been discernible, as a yawning gulf, to any man who took a comprehensive and enlightened view of the state of popular education. It is no wonder that the project of filling it up should have suggested itself, almost simultaneously, to many minds; the wonder would have been, that it should *not* have suggested itself; the wonder, perhaps, *is*—although there have probably occurred obstacles, with which we are not acquainted—that the work should have been so long delayed, and that its felt necessity did not sooner urge the most influential persons in the Church to undertake its accomplishment.

Still the simple fact remains, that we advocated the present plan in different Articles of this Review, before the Home and

Colonial Infant School Society was instituted, and before any of the persons, who are now prominent in pushing the design forward, had made, as far as we know, any *public* demonstration at least of their sentiments and intentions. We found many occasions,—and when we could not find them, we created them,—of calling attention to the principal features of the scheme of intermediate schools, to be made cheap, efficient, and attractive. We really are not aware of any advance or improvement upon the general principles which we have repeatedly laid down, or even of any other difference, than perhaps—for we have no means of speaking with certainty—a somewhat fuller development of them in their projected application. The frankness and straightforwardness with which we make these declarations will, we hope, procure us credit for being equally frank and straightforward in the declaration which we are about to make. We care nothing, then, into what hands the management of these schools may fall, provided only they are skilful and competent to the business; we have, personally, neither jealousy nor ambition on the subject; but we assert our share in the business, not for our own sakes, but for the sake of those Churchmen and those Church principles with which it has been our honest pride to be associated. On this account, we put in our claim; on this account, we would not willingly have it supposed that we have not been alive to the want of schools, such as are now, we trust, on the eve of being established; or that the matter, whether in its elements, or its details, is one which has escaped our notice, or awakened in us no interest. Let it be freely allowed, that this design is the natural growth of time and circumstance; that it has rather forced itself upon the age than merely presented itself to the mind of any single individual; or, in the words which Mr. Whewell has quoted for another purpose, that it is a thing *magis temporis quam ingenii*: but the more, therefore, should we regret, that our humble but persevering efforts should be put entirely out of view, when such institutions are planted and take root throughout the country;—as if we had actually lagged behind the march of contemporary thought, when, in point of fact, our most anxious meditations and our most strenuous labours—whatever their value and whatever their effect—have been devoted to the cause of general education in connection with Christianity, and social improvement in connection with the Church. At any rate, we discern in the present state of the undertaking a theme of congratulation to our fellow Churchmen, and to ourselves. If any men have been long desiring its success, and regretting not to see any apparent progress, let it be a fresh lesson to them, not to expect that general conviction is to be instantaneously produced, or that action is, of

necessity, instantaneously to follow conviction; but, not the less, to be resolute and persevering, never to be discouraged, never to despair;—let it be a fresh lesson to them, how plans, which are met at first with a frigid, apathetic, half-reluctant acquiescence, or even with sundry hints of visionary flightiness and utter impracticability, may yet ferment, as it were under ground, in a nation's mind, and break out at last in various quarters with an awakening explosion; like a fire, which it was for a time difficult to kindle, or which seemed extinct when it was only smouldering, but which on a sudden bursts forth in many places at once, and can set a whole forest in a blaze.

Matters having advanced so far, it must be a superfluous task to descant now upon the *want* of middle schools, or upon the *benefits* which must result from establishing them. The wretched inefficiency of so many "*seminaries*" and "*academies*," from the petty *dame-schools* upward;\* the narrow compass of instruction, and the slovenly way in which even these scraps and fragments are communicated; the generally low state of *systematic* education existing in a class of persons, who are yet invested with an almost predominant influence, and rubbed by the collisions of the world, and the friction of political and social freedom, into much of acuteness and intelligence;—their too frequent estrangement from the Established Church; the danger lest they should be more and more estranged; and the necessity of attaching them betimes to its creed and discipline;—all these are topics, on which it would be as easy, as it is, happily, needless, to expatiate. At the same time, too, full justice could not be done them, without entering into a multiplicity of particular and local details which we have no space to afford.

There remain, however, two or three points, on which we must just touch, not in the expectation of settling them, but for the purpose of showing that we have not overlooked them.

\* Even as to the points of *air* and *space*, and so, consequently, of health and vigour both of mind and body, a vast amelioration might be achieved. But here we can only make *another* reference to our former Article on the "*Social Improvement in connection with the Church*"; and would simply remark that, if the goal is to be completely gained, *physical*, and *architectural*, and *economical*, and *intellectual*, and *moral*, and *religious improvement*, must not merely be viewed as *separate* objects of inquiry, but must be taken together as the connected and mutually influencing parts of one mighty whole; they must be contemplated in their bearings and reference upon each other, both as to their *theory* or *general facts*, and their *statistics* or *particular facts*. How vast a field is open to Churchmen in that domain of social science, which relates to providence of habits, economy of diet, cleanliness, ventilation, and separation of dwellings; or, again, to wholesome exercise, simple pleasures, innocent recreations, and the sweet influences of nature! How much might be done, even here, to withdraw both adults and children from those vices, of which an enormous metropolis, full at once of luxury and penury, crime and concealment, is the pestilential hot-bed;—from those moral plagues, which crowded cities, in their actual state, infallibly engender!

1. The first of these is the *name* of the proposed schools. We have hitherto called them *middle schools*, for our own convenience. Yet, we are by no means disposed to insist upon this appellation; for, though it is comfortably brief, and, on the whole, sufficiently descriptive, it might not be found, in every case, altogether palatable to those, for whose use it was intended. The title *intermediate schools* lies nearly in the same predicament. The Germans, besides *Mittelschulen*, use the words *Realschulen*, and *Bürgerschulen*, which have been translated into *practical schools*, and *civic schools*; but neither of these terms seems preferable to *middle schools*. "*Burgher*" or "*Burgess*" Schools, or *Tradesman and Yeoman Schools*" would be scarcely better; and still less should we like any strange and pedantic designation, such as *Lyceum* or *Progymnasium*. We have heard the name *Commercial Proprietary Schools* suggested by one, who is as active and enlightened a promoter of general education as any man in the empire. It is possible, however, that one and the same denomination will not apply to all the schools which are wanted; for it may be neither expedient, nor feasible, to cast them all in the same mould, that is, to form them quite on the same pattern, or on the same scale of expense, or with the same list of teachers and studies.

2. For we come, as the second point, to *the persons who are to be taught in these schools*. Who are they? We should answer at once, *all* whose social position lies between the National Schools, and present Proprietary Schools. The Church is interested in the good education of all the children of the state; from the child of the highest noble, down to the child of the pauper in the workhouse. The Church, therefore, must cover with a good moral and intellectual tillage, all the ground which is now unoccupied; and get rid of an arbitrary and universal scheme of state-education by the only argument which will be convincing or satisfactory;—namely, by showing that the work may be achieved, and well achieved, by agencies already in operation. Nor do we see why middle schools, whether boarding or day-schools, should not be instituted for girls, as for boys:—nor why, to many of these middle schools, *infant schools* of a superior kind should not be attached, as several writers have already recommended the organisation, in suitable localities, of infant schools for the higher classes.

3. The third point is the *range of instruction* and the *mode of training* which these schools should exhibit. Here, we might talk much about the "education of the senses," the development and exercise of the mental faculties, the cultivation and regulation of the mental powers. There would be no difficulty in putting out an imposing *syllabus*, to include religion;

ethics; English language and literature; French, if not German;—the rudiments of Latin; history; geography, physical and political; arithmetic; mathematics, both as a pure science and as applied to mechanics and the uses of life; natural history and philosophy, in their various branches; chemistry, for instance, in its application to trade and manufactures; the elements of the fine arts, music, drawing, æsthetics, &c. &c. We might add, too, the acquisitions of an *industrial* to those of a philological and scientific school. But such things are more easily managed on paper than in reality. It is, perhaps, enough to say, that the instruction ought far to transcend, both in matter and method, both in quantity and quality, that which is now conveyed to the same class of recipients. In all probability, however, the range of instruction must be much diversified; as the schools themselves must range through several degrees of our population, and extend, sooner or later, through rural districts, as well as towns.

4. The fourth point,—and it is one which the foregoing may help us to determine,—is *the footing on which these schools are to be placed, and the machinery by which they are to be worked.* Some propose a large society, having its centre in the metropolis, and its ramifications throughout the country. Others would prefer a combination of shareholders, not, perhaps, excluding honorary members. For ourselves, we deem some Association indispensable; but we would rather avoid what is technically called *a Society*. The Society must be either old, or new. If old, it can be no other than the National Society. But to engraft such a system upon the National Society would be hardly consistent with its specific objects, and would, surely, too much encumber and complicate its operations: while some soreness might be engendered by annexing these intermediate schools to a system in itself charitable and eleemosynary. A new Society seems even more open to exception. For our own parts, at least, we look with something of dislike and distrust on the multiplication of Societies in a church, unless their institution is attended with some immediate, undeniable, and mighty advantage. Too often, instead of becoming well-adjusted and well-proportioned parts of the same whole, they clash with the old Associations, and throw discredit upon them; or they tend to make men forget that the Church itself is, after all, the great society, through which the nation is to be improved and Christianized; they become *foci* of an irregular and unepiscopal authority, which may ultimately be fraught with danger and confusion, not merely to the establishment, but to the Church itself as a religious and spiritual communion. Neither can we well perceive, what benefit, otherwise unattainable, would be gained by the formation of a new Society for the

management of these middle schools. The object, it should be remembered, is not to bring under education children who are quite uneducated; for they already receive instruction, such as it is; and to schools, such as they are, they already go; neither is it, primarily at least, to raise funds; for the combination of proprietors would ensure cheapness; and the same money which is now consumed, would, perhaps, be found amply sufficient, if more wisely distributed and more economically expended. The chief fear, however, is, lest the formation of a society should excite jealousy, by having an appearance of ostentatious patronage, which would be injudicious on the one side and unacceptable on the other: lest it should take, or appear to take, the government of the schools almost entirely out of the grasp of the persons most concerned, namely, the parents of the children who would attend them. Yet these parents form no small portion of the "*Monarchy of the Middle Classes.*" They are accustomed to the possession of power, and to the independent use of it. They are accustomed, and they wish, to have the management of affairs lodged in their own hands, and directed by their own energies. They think themselves quite as capable of self-government as any of their fellow-subjects; and they also think self-government better than a dictation or despotism the most paternal. They would like others to work *with* them, rather than *for* them. It would be a blunder to do too much, even in their behalf. True it is, as we have said, that the Church should pay attention to all classes, and to every individual in them all, at every stage of life. But the task here requires the nicest delicacy of handling. A quiet, unassuming, yet energetic, mode of procedure, would be, we imagine, the most effective and the least liable to misconception, though it might seem less direct and less imposing;—one, we mean, not far different from the measures which were pursued in establishing King's College. Let a good school be organized, as a model upon which, and a nucleus around which, others might be reared; having a strong committee composed of clergymen and laymen, and some distinguished prelate or prelates, for patron and visitor; let the parochial clergy, in their several districts, point out its advantages, and invite parents and guardians to send children to it, for their own and the common good,—and the thing is done. But we meant not to dogmatize: a new society *may* be found absolutely requisite: whether it should be called "*the Middle School Society,*" or "*the Intermediate School Society,*" or by any other name: for some of the schools may not be formed on the proprietary system, but may be merely kept up by a fixed payment, weekly, monthly, or quarterly, mounting from the rate of three-pence or six-pence per week to

a much higher sum. Let us only remark, that the plan should be expansive and progressive, pliant and flexible, easily turned into a variety of channels and adaptations, circumstances and localities. If it is too rigid and unelastic, it will fail of its purposes.

5. The last point but one on which we have room to animadvert will elucidate and strengthen this position ; namely, *the other institutions and means of improvement which may be joined and incorporated with these middle schools*. It may sometimes happen, that part of the existing machinery will be retained ; and that masters, for instance, of the present commercial establishments will change their plan, and become masters of schools on the new principle. But these cases will, perhaps, be comparatively few : for, although we are sorry to hurt either the interests or the feelings of any class of persons, we cannot but apprehend, that too many, who have never learnt any thing properly, think themselves qualified to teach almost every thing. Generally, therefore, we suppose, new buildings will be erected. In these, there may be sometimes what is called a *theatre* : there will be always a *large and capacious room*. Facilities, therefore, will be afforded to a system of catechizing ; or rather, perhaps, as we have before recommended, to a series of *theological lectures*, composed in a systematic but popular manner, which will instruct the middle classes, not merely in the plain doctrines and duties of the gospel, but in the history of their religion, and the constitution and polity of their Church. There might also be a *locus in quo* for evening lectures on subjects of general knowledge, not dissociated from Christianity ; and the same building might combine, at a great saving of expense, *two kinds of institutions, distinct, yet naturally and closely allied* ; namely, schools for the children, and places of intellectual advancement and recreation for the parents also, to which might be attached a *library*, a *museum*, and something of a *philosophical apparatus*, the master of the school being librarian and curator. We have always had in contemplation these, and other, possible accompaniments of middle schools ; not, of course, in all districts or quite at the beginning, but gradually and in favourable situations. In some cases, there might, perhaps, be annexed to them a *School of Arts* or a *School of Design*.

6. May we presume to add one word as to the *temper* in which this capital undertaking should be uniformly conducted ? We do hope, then, that the Church and Churchmen will conduct it,—even while it will do more to reclaim and bring back the stragglers of the population into their fold than any other means which they could use,—not as if a triumph over adversaries was the first thing in their view,—not as in the indulgence of a bristling and

splenetic opposition,—not as if chiefly animated by political or polemical animosity against this party or that sect,—but as in the natural performance of a task which Providence has intrusted to them, and of a duty which they owe to themselves; as in the calm and steady prosecution of their own legitimate objects;—those righteous objects which every churchman will appreciate according to the true amount of his patriotism and his religion, and which the national Church itself, to which, in theory at least, the whole nation spiritually belongs, is bound not to neglect.

But we have exceeded our limits, and must conclude; although we have only been enabled just to indicate topics which might constitute abundant matter for many copious and elaborate articles. Middle schools in connection with the Church are now likely to have an auspicious commencement: may they go on and prosper. Difficulties will, of course, arise. It may be more difficult for a time to work such a system in England, than in Scotland, or on the Continent. It will be difficult at first to establish one school on a model quite complete: it will be difficult at first to procure *good masters* for general superintendence, or *good teachers* in the several departments, or *good books* and *educational treatises*. But churchmen must begin to look, strenuously, carefully, and actively, to these things; and they may, at least, adopt that expressive word, which was chosen, we believe, for a motto by a Russian University, *Paulatim*. We have good hopes, even on human grounds; and—what is best of all—God's blessing may be expected.

It is self-evident, that we can be in no way pledged to the approval of details, which are not yet before us, either in the constitution or in the management of the proposed enterprise: but we hail with cordial satisfaction the practical recognition of the great principle, or object, which we consider to be two-fold; *first, to give to the "intermediate" classes, a higher, wider and better education, more in harmony with the general intelligence of the age, and the relation which they bear to the classes above and below them; and, secondly, to attach them to the Church by this the most potent of all agencies, the first in the order of time, and the first in the order of excellence.* We rejoice that the project is taken up, in the full devotedness of their zeal, by pious and unwearied servants in God's vineyard; and that laymen, whether of established reputation, or of the very highest promise, are aiding the good work. We anticipate the future with confidence: for we already see a glorious impetus imparted to the cause of education in connection with religion: we already see just and wide notions entertained both as to *persons* and *things*, the persons who require tuition, and the things which require to be taught:



we already see the true distinction taken between *training* and *teaching*, *education* and mere *instruction*; we already see all things beginning to be regarded, which go towards the foundation of a prudent, a virtuous, and a Christian character: we already see the philosophy of the subject, and the statistics of the subject, carried forward together, and tending to the completion and perfection of each other.

---

Since the foregoing pages were written and printed, we have had opportunities of knowing, that a plan for the formation and superintendence of intermediate schools has been matured. It would, however, be presumptuous and unbecoming in us even to touch upon the specific proposals, which, we believe, will be forthwith announced from the quarter to which they properly belong. Yet we may state our conviction, that the scheme will be found one emanating from the right source,—true to the cause of Christianity and the National Church; yet holding itself aloof from political faction, and seeking to enlist in its favour enlightened and conscientious men of the two great parties in the state:—clear and well-defined in its principles, yet not bound in its executive and administrative details, by a code of narrow stipulations:—distinct in its object, but, as to its means, able to take advantage of all the various agencies, and instrumentalities, and modes of proceeding, which may present themselves from time to time;—malleable into many shapes, susceptible of continual accessions and modifications, capable of almost infinite adaptation to the diversity of localities and circumstances:—holding friendly relations with the Church Societies already in existence, but itself having a Central Institution, and not a Society by name, for the basis of its operations:—effecting its purposes, partly by the introduction of a new machinery, partly by the adoption and improvement of the old, and wishing, therefore, to attach to itself the conductors of the present Commercial Schools, and to secure their cordial co-operation, rather than to injure their interests, as also to assist, rather than subvert the schools themselves, by affording to them encouragement and sanction, without a vain parade of patronage, by receiving them into union and alliance, by exhibiting a model in conformity with which they may be regulated, and by suggesting beneficial changes and extensions in their system of instruction.

Such, we imagine, will be the eventual character of the proposed design. The Bishop of London has already alluded to it in the

preface of his sermon on "*National Education*," recently preached at St. Martin's in the Fields; a sermon which it is not for us to praise, unless, comparing the bishop with himself, we may say, that in vigour and comprehensiveness of conception, in energy, and terseness, and beauty of diction, this discourse appears to us even more admirable than his lordship's former publications. And here we should be glad, if we had room, to notice the late sermons of Mr. Dale and Mr. Burgess—gentlemen, whose names ought hardly to be passed over in silence, when we are speaking of "*Intermediate Schools*." But we must return to the Bishop of London, who "thinks that an effort should be made to establish schools of a better sort; not merely, however, for the children of the working classes, as we commonly understand the expression, but for the class next above them, the little tradesmen and artisans." "*I have long*," adds his lordship, "*been desirous of seeing this effort systematically made, and I now rejoice in the certainty of its being made.*"

As the bishop states in a note that "this suggestion was made by the Rev. T. V. Short, Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury, in a valuable tract published in 1835," we would remark, in justice to ourselves, and lest we should be suspected of having pretended to strike out a notion, when we in fact borrowed it from Dr. Short, that our first mention of it in this Review was made, unless we are much mistaken, several months before the publication of his pamphlet, and certainly more than a year before it happened to come under our own eyes. It would be worse, however, than absurd to doubt the originality of Dr. Short's proposition, since the subject, we understand, has been for years upon his mind; as, indeed, upon the minds of others, both clergymen and laymen, in London and elsewhere. We state these things—and for the same reason we leave our Article uncanceled and substantially unaltered—simply that we may evince the keen interest which we have taken, on many occasions, in our office as Reviewers and in our individual capacity, with respect to the contemplated undertaking, and our honest desire, when the vessel is launched, and the breeze is favourable, to see—

"our little bark attendant sail,  
Pursue the triumph, and partake the gale."

---

- ART. VII.—1. *Draft of a Fifth Report of the Commissioners appointed to consider the State of the Established Church in England and Wales, with reference to Ecclesiastical Revenues; also the Correspondence thereon.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 22d December, 1837.
2. *Chapter and Collegiate Memorials, addressed to the Church Commissioners in 1836 and 1837.* Rivingtons. 1838.
3. *A Letter on the Augmentation of a particular Class of Poor Livings, without burthening the Public.* By the Earl of Harrowby. Reprinted in 1831.
4. *Bill to abridge the holding of Benefices in Plurality, and to make better Provision for the Residence of the Clergy.* Printed 23d December, 1837.
5. *The Ecclesiastical Commission and the Universities.* By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1837.
6. *Some Observations on the tendency of a Measure for the future Regulation of Cathedral and Collegiate Bodies, of which Notice has been given in Parliament, by her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department.* By J. H. Spry, D.D., Prebendary of Canterbury. 1838.
7. *The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission examined, in a Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chichester.* By H. E. Manning, M.A., Rector of Lavington, in the Diocese of Chichester, and late Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. 1838.
8. *The Correspondence between the Ecclesiastical Commission and the Bishop of Ely.* 1837.
9. *A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham.* By C. Thorp, D.D., Archdeacon of Durham. [Printed by desire of the Clergy, not published.] 1836.
10. *The Prebendary, or Cathedral Establishment, Ancient and Modern, being the Substance of Letters in the Morning Herald in 1836 and 1837. Part I.* Hatchard. 1838.
11. *Are Cathedral Institutions useless? a Practical Answer to this Question.* Eton. 1838.
12. *On the Proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission. A Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln.* By C. Benson, M.A., Master of the Temple.
13. *Reduction of Prebendaries.* By F. A. Glover, M.A., Rector of Charlton, in Dover.
14. *Observations on the Illegal and Unconstitutional Character of the Ecclesiastical Commission.* By a Layman. Oxford. 1838.
15. *"Continuing daily with one accord in the Temple."* A Ser-

*mon on the Daily Service of the Church, particularly in Cathedrals, preached in the Cathedral of Chichester, on Sunday, 19th November, 1837.* By the Very Rev. George Chandler, D.C.L., Dean of Chichester and Rector of All Souls, St. Mary-le-bone. London: Parker. 1837.

IN order to understand the character and probable issue of the late Ecclesiastical Commission, it is necessary to trace the steps by which it has arrived at its present dimensions. It was ushered in and prepared by another, in many respects of a different character, that appointed June 23, 1831, "to inquire into the Ecclesiastical Revenues of England and Wales," which presented its Report June 16, 1835. For this was a *mere* Commission of Inquiry; and the Church had too much reason to desire such an inquiry — so preposterous were the statements of her wealth, which up to this point were circulated, and, because often repeated, were believed. With regard to the sister branch of the Church, in Ireland, they were acted upon; and even a member of the cabinet confessed, in a late stage of a bill affecting that Church, that they had been legislating under grossly exaggerated notions of her income. The good then to be obtained might make the Church acquiesce in the irregularity of the measure, and in the unlawful powers given even to that Commission. It might indeed have been better, had the ecclesiastical bodies or persons concerned addressed his late majesty to revoke that Commission, professing their readiness at the same time to give the information in some more legal way. For even that Commission was clearly illegal, the Crown having no right to make inquiry, unless it have, upon inquiry, the right to regulate; whereas the Crown has no more right to regulate the property of the Church, than to re-distribute that of the barons, who did indeed once hold of it. However, it seemed likely to lead to no evil results, since, in this Commission, legislation was kept carefully out of sight; the Commissioners themselves probably felt that they did not really possess the powers professedly committed to them, and so did not exercise them; no one, we believe, was "examined upon oath," and no one compelled to "produce any rolls, records, orders, books, papers, or other writings;" and although there were "178 non-returns among the benefices," and "223 among the impropriations," the Commissioners wisely abstained from pressing a claim, which might have been successfully resisted, and which would have brought the crown into disgrace. The returns then to this Commission were merely voluntary acts of courtesy; they were produced partly by that dislike which Englishmen have to any needless concealment, partly by the dread perhaps that the keeping back of the information would be imputed to the wish of concealing some extraordinary wealth, partly out of respect for the authority, although ille-

gally exercised, whence it emanated. The clergy had nothing to conceal, and so they told all, though they had no need. This Report also, we have reason to know, was probably, from the very machinery employed and the haste with which it was compiled, inaccurate, and for any practical purposes inadequate; it may, on the whole, very tolerably represent the whole amount of ecclesiastical property, although it probably overstates that of the deans and chapters; (and indeed, as the Commissioners soon discovered, the average of three years, as applied to them or to the bishops, was altogether absurd.) We know, from a number of instances, that the returns do *not* represent the real value of many of the benefices; we know, also, as was to be expected, that the clergy, in making the returns, proceeded upon no fixed principle, some making one deduction, some another; so that, as to details, this Report is not at all to be depended upon; not to mention the great alteration, which the Tithe Bill will soon cause.

This Commission, having completed its task, expired. Those who were in any influential post, will recollect the strong doubts which were felt as to the propriety of recognizing its authority; these doubts, however, as was stated, gave way, in most cases, after more or less of hesitation; a seeming straight-forwardness overbalanced wisdom; with some misgiving, especially on the part of those to whom age and experience had given wisdom, the inquiries were answered; and the first Commission having obtained its end, though with some difficulty, the way was prepared for another. The thin edge of the wedge had now been introduced.

In the first Commission, legislation, as was said, was carefully excluded; in the second, it was not yet introduced; but a further step was gained, by issuing a Commission, which should recommend with a view to legislation. Still, *through whom* that legislation was to take place, was not expressed; the consent of the Church, at least of her bishops, might, it was naturally supposed, be asked for. Then also people had, by the last Commission, become accustomed to the idea of a Commission; they had overcome and acted against their reluctance in the one case, and so, although things were now further advanced, they could the less readily or consistently act against the other. One may now see how much wiser it had been, had the chapters, *e. g.*, declined giving all information except in a legal way, and how much forethought there was in what, to younger men, seemed a timid hesitation on the part of the elder members of the cathedrals. Having gone, however, thus far in the one case, they could scarcely do otherwise than wait and see the result in the other. Then again this second Commission came from their friends, at a critical time; much, although a mistaken importance, was evidently attached to

it; and it might appear hardly grateful to embarrass by what *might be* a premature opposition, the whole measures of government. The king had cast himself upon those who advised this measure; much seemed at stake; and it was the more patient course, and incurred the least responsibility, to wait in silence. Whatever feeling then may have been excited by the first issuing of the second Commission, was suppressed, or at least held in, in anxious expectation of the result.

The objects proposed to the Commissioners were limited in many respects; they were appointed for

“considering the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales, with reference to the amount of their revenues, to the more equal distribution of episcopal duties, and to the prevention of the necessity of attaching by commendam, to bishoprics, benefices with cure of souls: also for considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches within the same, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render them most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church, and for devising the best mode of providing for the cure of souls, with special reference to the residence of the clergy on their respective benefices.”

And the king, in his speech at the opening of parliament shortly after, adhered strictly to the same language;

“I have appointed a Commission for considering the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales, with reference to the amount of their revenues, and to the more equal distribution of episcopal duties; the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render them most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church: and for devising the best mode of providing for the cure of souls, with reference to the residence of the clergy on their respective benefices. The especial object which I have in view, in the appointment of this Commission, is to extend more widely the means of religious worship according to the doctrines of the Established Church, and to confirm its hold upon the veneration and affections of my people.”

The majority of two given to laymen at this first issuing of the Commission, excited probably melancholy forebodings in the minds of many,\* as being a tribute to the liberalism of the day;

\* To give one, and the earliest printed, instance, the advertisement to the “Restoration of Suffragan Bishops recommended, as a means of effecting a more equal Distribution of Episcopal Duties, as contemplated by his Majesty’s recent Ecclesiastical Commission.” By J. H. Newman, M.A., 1835. “The writer of the following remarks thinks it advisable to state at the outset, with reference to the recent Commission, that without pronouncing how far and in what cases the formal approval of the Church to the report of such a Commission may be dispensed with, agreeably to ecclesiastical usage,—or how far a Commission is of authority in which the lay members outnumbered the clerical,—or how far it is expedient or pious to alienate for the benefit of other places endowments left for the uses of particular sees or parishes, he desires to view the Commission as the expression of the Church’s wish for certain changes in her economy, sanctioned and furthered by the king, as her supreme governor, at the instance of the bishops, his natural ecclesiastical advisers.”

some, doubtless, objected rightly to the appointment of laymen at all. What had laymen to do with "the more equal distribution of episcopal duties," or how should they know in what way "cathedral and collegiate churches might be rendered most conducive to the efficiency of the Church?" Duties can only be thoroughly understood practically, "episcopal duties" by bishops; and the mode in which laymen have discharged the office, which during the disputed succession consequent upon the Revolution, they began to assume, of filling the cathedrals in the king's name, gives little ground to think that they understood what would "render them most conducive to the efficiency of the Church." These were purely ecclesiastical duties; and, thus expressed, we hardly see how laymen could think they fell within their province. At this crisis, however, it seemed wisest and most grateful to remain quiet; in political matters, these same persons had acted with a chivalrous disregard of self; and so with sorrowful thoughts how this concession on the part of the bishops, concerned with this arrangement, would end, and vain regrets that they had shrunk from the responsibility, and had not, like ancient bishops, taken the whole matter into their own hands, we had to devour our own griefs, and wait for the end.

The first Report of this Commission rather mitigated the apprehensions entertained as to the *extent* of the meditated changes, while, for the time, it took away all hope that sudden change could be resisted.

"No one," said perhaps the ablest advocate\* of gentle and silent, in opposition to sudden, reform, "no one, who reasons, can doubt that from this moment the change which the Report proposes is the least which (humanly speaking) can possibly happen. Other governments there may be, but what government will do less? The changes recommended must be considered as actually achieved; the principles on which they proceed, as actually established, and their effects as inevitable. The battle has been fought, in a word, and is lost."

Discouraging as was the prospect of remonstrance or objection, there was also, in this first Report, but little tangible whereon to ground it. Most of it related to the bishops, and though the notice which seemed to imply the assent of the whole episcopal order was ambiguously expressed, it was enough to deter the lower orders of the clergy from interfering.

"We have used," it is said, "our best endeavours to learn the opinions of the several bishops, respecting these proposed arrangements, as far as

\* Rev. Hugh J. Rose, *British Magazine*, April, 1835, p. 470. The feeling and vivid passage which follows these words, illustrates what are the feelings which these changes have torn up, while they have increased, not silenced, clamour.

they affect their respective dioceses, and have availed ourselves of many suggestions, which their local knowledge enabled them to supply."

This, in its plain meaning, implied the assent of the bishops; if it did not, the body of the clergy were unintentionally deceived; if it did, then probably the absence of direct opposition must have been misconstrued into assent; for we *now* know that many of the bishops did finally object to these measures, some consented to enlarge or contract their dioceses according to these new dimensions, very unwillingly, and upon much importunity, lest by holding out, they should overthrow a measure now agreed on; and into some of the arrangements they have not entered at all. At any rate, their assent ought not to have been even required within such a space; the six brief and exciting weeks which had elapsed since the appointment of the Commission, were clearly not enough to form, arrange, decide upon, propose, and receive the matured judgment of the several bishops upon a plan so intricate and involving so many and manifold considerations. Yet on February 5d, 1835, did this Commission appear in the Gazette; on March 17th the first Report was presented. Six weeks alone were allowed for remodelling almost every diocese of the Church in England, for re-distributing and re-moulding it. One should have thought that six times six weeks had been far too little for settling the first principles upon which such a distribution (if it were to take place) should be formed; one should think that, now the work is for the present accomplished, its very authors might look back with amazement upon their work and upon themselves. It seems more like one of those rapid transformations, which in boyish days one saw on the stage effected by the wand of the magician, than a real act, intended by real bishops to consolidate and strengthen the government of a portion of the Church of Christ. There seems ground to think that this implied assent of the majority of the bench of bishops, existed rather in anticipation than in reality; that the Commissioners consulted, upon some points, those from whom they wished for local knowledge, and looked to these schemes being eventually adopted by them, or enforced upon their successors. The public papers on the side of the then government had at that time an especial object in speaking of the consultations of the Commissioners, and it seems probable from the notices which these gave at the time, as well as from subsequent indications, that this first Report was the work of one or two bishops only.

Hasty, however, as this first Report was, it was altogether of a different character from its successors.

1. It proposed, indeed, that two bishoprics should be merged in adjoining bishoprics, and two new ones created. A hazardous step, truly, if this were to be done by the Crown, since in our



Church there was no precedent for it, except in the iniquitous times of Henry VIII. Nor did even he suppress any ancient bishopric.\* The *erection* of a bishopric on the part of the Crown, without the formal assent of the Church, by no means implies any right of *suppressing* a bishopric which has been erected. The Crown's share in erecting these bishoprics was in making over the funds by which the bishops are supported; but these it gave in perpetuity, and has no right to resume them. Or should it in an evil hour for itself do even this, yet, in Mr. Manning's energetic words:—

“The consecrated overseer of Christ's flock still remains; no power can recall him, but that which gave his spiritual commission. The same hands that lengthened out the apostolic line, can alone break it off. Here is the mistake. Politicians treat bishoprics as a simple element, to be made or unmade by the omnipotence of Parliament. They do not remember that there are combined two elements, an earthly and a heavenly; two authorities, one of men and one of God. If the earthly and the human be removed, yet that which cannot be shaken,—the divine and heavenly authority,—must remain.”—*Letter*, pp. 26, 27.

The first Report, however, did not express *through whom* this solemn transfer was to take place; the difficulties which have prevented the assemblies of the inferior clergy, apply not to the meeting of the bishops, who, *until the period of this Commission*, did periodically and continually meet for those things which concerned the Church, at Queen-Anne's-Bounty Board. It was a virtual, though not a formal Synod. Then, also, the act itself seemed altogether more like a transfer than an extinction; all the members of the episcopal body were kept entire.—*It did not put out any one of the eyes, it did not remove a candlestick, of the Anglican Church.*

2. *It did not make the bishops stipendiaries*, or the payments from the richer to the poorer sees compulsory. The mode of providing for the poorer bishoprics which *it* proposed, was,—

“By *enabling* the future incumbents of the richer sees to transfer part of their estates to the poorer bishoprics, or to pay over annually a portion of their incomes to the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, to be applied to the augmentation of such bishoprics; or either of these modes might be adopted, according to the particular circumstances of the case.”

\* See authorities in Mr. Manning's Letter, pp. 25, 26. In Edward VI.'s time, Gloucester was for a while suppressed, through the greediness of the courtiers. *Burnet, ib.* “On the lowest ground,” says Mr. Manning, “our modern politicians who contend so vehemently for Tudor precedents in Church affairs, ought, at least, to abide by the same rule in constitutional questions; either to admit both or reject both. But precedents are our guides, only where no antecedent principles exist; we must in such cases gather our rule as best we may, by an induction of particular cases; but where principles have existed by an original ordinance, *contrary precedents are only breaches and violations.*”

There was no violence offered to property, or the rights of property, or the independence of the several sees, but only a proposed re-arrangement among the bishops themselves for what was supposed to be a benefit to the Church.

3. *There was no contemplation of the extinction of ONE prebend or canonry, but the contrary.* The Commission was issued thus far,—

“For considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches within the same, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render *them* most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church.”

The king in his Speech had used the same language:—

“I have appointed a Commission for considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render them most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church.”

Accordingly, *this Report*, in conformity with the terms of the Commission and the Speech, mentioned two ways in which the prebends might promote this end, *by annexation*, 1st, to some of the poorer bishoprics, 2dly, to some of the more populous and destitute places, wherewith they were connected.

On the first point the Report says:—

“The most obvious mode of supplying the deficiency [in the whole amount of episcopal revenue, occasioned by the proposed grant of the episcopal impropriations, in whole or in part, to the respective parishes] will be, permanently to annex to some of the poorer bishoprics certain cathedral preferment; particularly in the chapters of St. Paul’s and Westminster, on account of their position in the metropolis.”

For the other, the very haste with which the vacancy of a prebendal stall of Westminster was seized upon to introduce the subject of the annexation of these stalls to large parishes, out of its regular course, the more illustrates the importance attached to this principle, and the effect expected from its announcement. Thanks were conveyed to his majesty for suspending the appointment to that stall; his “deepest interest in the successful prosecution of the Commission” announced; and some credit was evidently expected to be derived to the ministry, for not bestowing the nomination as a sinecure. Moreover, in the case thus seized upon, so far as related to the parish annexed, that of St. Margaret’s, Westminster, little or no actual alteration was made;\*

\* It was before *annexed* to the whole cathedral; the whole body of prebendaries was responsible for it, though, practically, the cure had, unhappily, been delegated to one prebendary; by this Report it was proposed permanently to annex it to one prebend, which is subdivided. “The parish contained, by the last census, 25,334;” (*Rep. I.*) so that as to real parochial cure nothing is gained. There can be no parochial superintendence now; whereas, had the prebend not been subdivided, but the

whence it the more appears, that the object of this anticipation was to bring out the principle upon which the new Commission purposed to proceed; it was to show that his majesty's government was intent on abolishing what had been made sinecures, and so promoting what would popularly be thought a reform.

Lastly, towards the conclusion of the Report, the Commissioners echo the terms of their appointment, and say,—

“ We shall forthwith take into our consideration, the present state of the several cathedrals and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with the view of submitting to your majesty some measures by which those foundations may be made more conducive than they now are, to the efficiency of the Established Church.”

Throughout, they are the “ foundations” themselves, not the *funds* of the foundations, the “ several cathedral and collegiate churches,” not “ money arising from the confiscation of their stalls and revenues,” whereby it was up to this time proposed, by his late majesty, by those who recommended the issuing of the Commission, and by those who acted in it, to benefit the Church.

4. *A sounder and more legitimate, and far more effectual, way of providing for spiritual wants was then in contemplation; viz. by means of the impropriations.* This is noticed in several parts of the Report. As an apology for uniting the two dioceses of St. Asaph and Bangor it is said :—

“ One advantage which will result from the union of these two sees will be, the opportunity afforded of applying a part of the impropriations, which constitute nearly the whole property of the bishoprics, to the augmentation of poor and populous vicarages in the united diocese.”

And again,—

“ A further diminution (in the future income of the bishoprics) is also to be expected from the application, *either in whole or in part*, of impropriations, which form a considerable portion of the incomes of many bishoprics, and which, in most instances, they were compelled to accept in exchange for manors and estates, for the improvement of populous and poorly endowed vicarages and curacies connected with them.”

5. Even in the wholly subordinate subject of patronage, they equally abstain from taking away a trust from those who had it, to give it to those to whom it had not been committed. Their recommendations on this point are plainly very scrupulous. They say,—

“ If your majesty shall be pleased to concur in the suggestion for erecting two new sees, it will, in our opinion, be expedient for the incumbent required to keep a body of curates, enough might have been left to maintain a superior person at the head, and a good deal of parochial cure might have been obtained. In that case no principle would have been violated; but on what principle can a stall be subdivided?

terests of the Church, that the bishops of those sees shall possess a certain portion of patronage, in order that they may be enabled to reward deserving clergymen within their dioceses. For this purpose it will be necessary to transfer some advowsons to the bishops of the new sees.

"We do not propose that when a district is transferred from one diocese to another, the whole of the patronage within such district should likewise pass; but in many instances a partial transfer will be desirable."

This still maintained the character of an arrangement among the bishops themselves. A fuller consultation of the bishops would indeed have afforded a more definite recommendation; but such as it was, it was obviously a consequence of the re-distribution of their dioceses; when a bishop parted with a portion of his cure to another, it was natural that he should, in most cases, part with the subordinate appointments, the parochial benefices in that portion of his cure. This was in entire conformity with the original relation of the bishop and his clergy.

Such was the Conservative stage of the Commission, or (since it was shortly after broken up) one may say, such was the Conservative Commission. Its provisions were not satisfactory; they did not remedy, they scarcely palliated, the evils on the particular subject to which they applied; and it was a comfort that they did not even palliate them, since palliatives are more fatal than the diseases; they drive them in, where they work concealed, and so the more fatally. It was impossible that any scheme should even palliate the existing evils, which should attempt to portion out the population of England and Wales among twenty-four bishops, the same number which the Church had three centuries ago, when Westminster and Liverpool were villages; our manufacturing towns, commons; and Lancashire a moor.

The want of additional bishops was strongly felt by Bede\* in 735, when there were seventeen bishoprics. Cranmer, when the population of England was but 4,400,000, wished to raise the number of sees to *sixty*, and herein he acted on the primitive model; and now, when the population must considerably exceed 14,000,000, to attempt to portion it out among bishops, only exceeding by one-third those of the time of Bede, must involve a manifest failure. The more equally you distribute 14,000,000 or 16,000,000 of souls among twenty-six bishops, the more completely will you efface the very notion of a bishopric, except for the purpose of transmitting the office to happier days, which may realize it. Accordingly the effect of these proposals, if

\* Newman's *Suffragan Bishops*, p. 12, note.

carried into effect, would be, to efface our smaller bishoprics, which are a sort of witness what a bishopric ought more nearly to be, to bring the intermediate bishoprics to a medium stage of unsatisfactoriness, and, of our three portentous bishoprics, to leave two out of three. Thus, under the old state of things, there were eight bishoprics, St. Asaph, Bangor, Ely, Llandaff, Oxford, Peterborough, Rochester, Carlisle, with the cure of from 126,316 to 200,000 souls; two of these, St. Asaph and Bangor, are to be united, and these same bishoprics to range from 303,875 to 471,813. Formerly, at the other extreme, there were three bishoprics, whose several charges exceeded one million, one approached to two millions; now there are to be two bishoprics, London and Manchester, (whereof London alone, if distributed among three, a bishop of London, of Westminster, and of Southwark, would have furnished three over-large bishoprics,) each with a population of above a million. Little, then, which could be called good, would be effected by this change, and the return to a better system delayed, but for the existence of those two great bishoprics, of London and Manchester, which obviously demanded a further remedy. Meantime, however, much evil was done. Evil was done by making changes which themselves required other corrective changes; evil was done by effacing the smaller bishoprics, and thus accustoming persons to a lower degree of episcopal superintendence, and pastoral care; to do, and act, and live more, without bishops; to make bishops mere commissioners,

“The functionaries of statutes, the administrators of oaths, the agents of correspondence about the building of churches, the management of societies, and the serving of tables;”\*

instead of

“Living among their people, having the custody of the Christian Faith in their own place and day, and by their lives and conversation impressing it in all its saving fullness of doctrine and precept upon the face of society, the centres and emblems of Christian unity, the bonds of many minds, and the mementos of Him who is unseen.”

In this way, also, evil was done by the unnecessary severing of dioceses, distributing dioceses into arrondissemens, counting human souls like a flock of sheep, to be penned within a certain space, and so breaking through long attachments, and recollections, and associations: paring off from one diocese and adding to another, as if they could transfer affections, as they could square miles, or make feelings flow as they drew the lines upon a

\* Newman's *Suffragan Bishops*, p. 17.

map. It is the misfortune of persons who are the objects of affection or respect, that they often know not the reverence in which their office or their relation is held, even when little is known of their persons. The aristocracy have often thoughtlessly, in mere ignorance, worn out, or snapped, these bands which were meant to unite their dependents with themselves, and through them, bind up in one peaceful union the whole national family. They knew not the feelings, because they lay unexpressed till the occasion shall call them forth, or their expression was mistaken. The Commission made the like mistake in rounding dioceses, transferring portions of counties from one diocese to another; treating ecclesiastical England, as if it were now for the first time to be apportioned among twenty-six bishoprics, instead of regarding actual ties, feelings, and habits. The line which marks the bounds of a county is generally capricious; yet even among the falsely refined, that invisible bond exercises a power over them, which they acknowledge more or less in action, even while in theory they would disclaim it; charity would flow more freely on their own side of the invisible border; the poor within it are felt somehow more to belong to them; how much more power would the tie have over the simple-minded children of a Christian Church! The unity then of the dioceses ought not to have been needlessly broken; rather, when necessary, should a diocese have been divided into two or more integral portions, not the "*disjecta membra*" of one diocese scattered among several, as if broken limbs would cement speedily into the fair proportions of one compacted body.

This principle was not felt, and so was again and again needlessly violated. The arrangements were made with a rough hand. For instance, to what end to sever the north-west corner of Wiltshire (the deaneries of Malmsbury and Cricklade) from the diocese of Salisbury, to which the rest of the county belongs, and join it on to Gloucester? or, again, even more minutely, to detach certain *parishes* of the county of Worcester and attach them to Gloucester, to whose diocesan seat they are not even so near as to that in their own diocese and county?\* and this two-fold change did but approximate the diocese of Gloucester to the average population of bishoprics, by adding to it about 48,000, raising it from 275,806 to 324,198. Such changes are not effected without doing violence to many feelings; nor do parts thus joined coalesce at the fiat of a commission. The county of

\* Half of this plan has since been abandoned; that which related to Salisbury persisted in, against the wishes, it is understood, of the clergy at least, and of their bishop. The same vicious principle runs through all the Reports; and when it is abandoned in detail in the one case, it is committed anew in another.

Berks, from long habit associated in diocesan charities with that of Wiltshire, and looked upon itself as one diocese with it; joined on to the diocese of Oxford, the old diocese and the new addition are two distinct bodies under one head. They have no feeling of unity. Much more would this be the case should the county of Bucks be added on the other side. It would be, not a triple-headed but a triple-bodied monster. Instead of this petty joining on and taking-off, this adding and subtracting and squaring of sees, this so-called "equalizing" of dioceses, whereby the largest (London) was still to be just eight times the size of what, on the new regime, was to be the smallest (Hereford) and the "equalized" bishoprics were to vary from 218,392 to 1,746,504, with a difference of above 1,500,000, a more courageous, and therefore a wiser policy, would have kept unimpaired the smaller bishoprics, and boldly proposed a plan to remedy the deficiencies of the larger. A plan which should have at least divided Lincoln, Exeter, and Winchester, into two; London, York, and Lichfield and Coventry, into three, or given them this proportion of suffragan bishops; and Chester into four, would have commanded respect; and the moral courage exerted in making it would have overawed discontent, even in quarters where the manifest necessity of the proposal did not put opposition to shame. Men, who would have proposed this, would have been seen to be in earnest about remedying our ecclesiastical deficiencies, and probably, no very serious difficulty would have been raised by the opponents of the Church; these could not appreciate the spiritual change of investing a dean with the office of a bishop;\* they could only estimate votes in the House of Lords. Report said, that a timid policy among the Conservative party prevented it; for fear that the precedent of bishops out of parliament should lead to the expulsion of the rest. This has no real ground; for the bishops are temporal barons; the new bishops would not have been; but such timidity is inconsistent with the character of a re-former, or renewer, or restorer of the Church. The single opening sentence then of the Report, "We are not prepared to recommend any increase in the total number of episcopal sees," dissipated every hope of amendment. Nothing but the increase of the "total number of bishoprics" would afford any real remedy; the plan proposed might disguise in some respects the extent of

\* At the same time that Mr. Newman's interesting pamphlet appeared on the general subject, a sketch of a specific plan for relieving our bishops, by the same means, was drawn by a different hand, in the *British Magazine*, March, 1835, for which, however, there were not then adequate materials, since the Report of Ecclesiastical Revenues had not been published.

the evil, by reducing the more privileged, more nearly to the condition of the less privileged, dioceses;\* but it could not remove the necessity of further change. The English Church, heretofore, had increased her bishoprics in proportion to the increase of her population; this principle of our Church was, for the first time, abandoned, and extensive changes were made, and all the evils of unsettlement incurred, although these changes must be again changed, if any real improvement was ever to be made, or our Church ever to enjoy fully her birthright of Episcopal superintendence. It was, too, evil, and of evil precedent, that the clergy of the dioceses of Bangor and St. Asaph were tempted willingly to resign one of their bishops, and to choose a condition spiritually less advantageous, by the bribe of the prospect of an improvement to their benefices. The Report proposed—

“That the Sees of St. Asaph and Bangor should be united;—on advantage which will result from the union of these two sees will be the opportunity afforded of applying a part of the impropriations, which constitute nearly the whole property of the bishoprics, to the augmentation of poor and populous vicarages in the united diocese.”

Harm then was done in the direct proposals of this first Report, in that change was introduced, without any real benefit, and change contrary to the former character of our Church, and violating old attachments and relations. Still, this Report though disadvantageous in detail, violated no great principles; and in every important principle differed from its successors, in that—1. it extinguished altogether no bishopric; 2. invaded no rights of property; 3. maintained the independence of the bishops; 4. proposed to preserve the chapters; 5. was guarded even as to the trusts of patronage; 6. was in the right, and safe and old way of providing for spiritual wants by the ecclesiastical impropriations and annexation; 7. it implied or recommended no

\* The following table shows the relative size of our bishoprics, as they were, and as they are to be remodelled:—

	old.	new.
Above 100,000 souls and below 200,000 .....	8	0
200,000 ————— 300,000 .....	4	2
300,000 ————— 400,000 .....	3	8
400,000 ————— 500,000 .....	3	7
500,000 ————— 600,000 .....	0	4
600,000 ————— 700,000 .....	1	1
700,000 ————— 800,000 .....	2	2
800,000 ————— 900,000 .....	1	0
900,000 ————— 1,000,000 .....	1	0
1,000,000 and upwards .....	3	2

† Except in what related not to the subject of the Report, the hasty sub-division of the stall of Westminster, which (even if the right existed anywhere) none but the chapter, or the whole Church, had a right to do.



permanent board with a majority of laymen to decide in ecclesiastical affairs; 8, in a word, *it maintained all our old institutions, rights, trusts, foundations, and the oaths and adjurations hereby they are guarded, inviolate and inviolable, and adapted only ancient institutions to ends which were in part, at least, contemplated by their founders.*

With regard to the principle of annexation, although, if carried too great an extent, it would destroy many of the purposes of cathedral institutions, yet, on any judicious and matured system, it would be but carrying out, on a regular plan, what exists ready. It would produce no organic change in the constitution of our Church.

This Commission expired with the administration of Sir R. Peel. That statesman had made the mistake not unfrequent with his complexion of policy; he had proposed alterations, about which people cared not, and thereby hoped to be able to withhold those about which men anxious for change cared. These cared not whether we had three or two dioceses exceeding 1,000,000 souls; they had listened with satisfaction, as an argument for extinguishing ten sees in Ireland, that an English metropolitan could discharge the duties of a diocese containing a million and a half of souls; they cared not, in reality, whether we had sinecures or not—the clamour, as far as it existed, was meant to obtain their confiscation, not their employment; they wished not to equalize bishoprics, but to equalize sects with the church; their idol was power and wealth; and alterations which gave them neither, had no interest for them. But Sir R. Peel opened a door which he could not close; he had established a principle, that there should be extensive change, even though in this case the change was not unprincipled, or without principles; yet the question, that there shall be change, once established, it was an easy transition from *change of some sort to change of any sort.* Sir R. Peel is not to be blamed that he was obliged to leave his work unfinished, and allow it to pass into other hands, wherein it should be carried on very differently; this was the result of past compromise. What he is to be blamed for was, the undue prominence which he gave to the measure of so-called church-reform; the haste with which it was hurried on; the appetite for change which he called forth, and, (which was the ground-work of all these) the employment (it may be unconsciously) of alterations in the Church as a means of increasing the stability of a secular party, or the mistaking the Church for a secular body. He thus loosened the confidence, which the lapse of a few years had begun a little to restore; agitated and perplexed the minds of those in whom the real strength of his line of politics lies; and

the Church having been made subservient to secular politics, was destined to suffer.

The new Commission was issued June 6, 1835, in the same terms as the preceding, only that five Whig politicians were substituted for the four Conservative, thereby showing the intention of the new ministry to make the Commission an instrument of power, and to maintain their authority in it. The ascendancy of laymen over the bishops was now as eight to five.

No immediate political end being now to be gained by any extraordinary celerity, the Second Report did not appear until about a year after the first. It bears date March 4, 1836, and was laid before Parliament March 10. The year which had elapsed, however, instead of maturing the views of the Commissioners, had unsettled them: within a year the whole face of things, and the prospects of the Church, were changed.

The Commission was re-issued in terms the same as before, but the second Report, in part, went *beyond* the objects of the Commission, recommending what its terms no ways authorized, *in part, went in direct contravention to those very terms.*

The gravest instance in which the second Report exceeded the Commission, was the wanton destruction of the ancient bishopric of Sodor and Mann.

"We are of opinion, also," it says, "that the bishopric of Sodor and Mann may, without inconvenience, be united to that of Carlisle, as the Isle of Mann contains only eighteen parishes; over which the archdeacon, who is resident, and has a respectable income, can exercise an effectual superintendence."

As if it were, *per se*, a good, that a bishopric should be suppressed, if it could be done "without inconvenience," for no positive ground is alleged; and the Episcopal office does indeed seem to be lightly appreciated, since the superintendence of an archdeacon is placed on a level with it; as if the one were as "effectual," and as holy, and as apostolic, as the other! To suppress a bishopric by the secular arm, and to compare the "superintendence" of an archdeacon with that of a bishop, are certainly in keeping. Setting this aside, however, it clearly exceeded their commission. The Commission did not entitle them to consider the state of the Isle of Mann at all, but only that of the dioceses of England and Wales; Mann is a separate branch of the Church, with a separate jurisdiction and legislature; and even with regard to English bishoprics, the objects of inquiry proposed were "the amount of their revenues, the more equal

distribution of episcopal duties, and the prevention of attaching, by commendam, to bishoprics *benefices with the cure of souls*," not the extinction of a bishopric, or (to use a mild term) that a bishopric should be held *in commendam*, in order that a deanery might not be. The same Report set aside the objections of the Bishop of Winchester to the severance of his suburban districts and their annexation to the see of London, on account of "the advantages of placing the metropolis and the suburban parishes under one jurisdiction." We confess we see not the advantage of placing under one bishop above 1,700,000 people, connected together by no bond, except the common boundary of the Reform Bill;\* yet, when this was felt to be so great a convenience, it seems strange that it should have seemed no "inconvenience" to join on an island to another diocese from which it is separated by a stormy sea, during the winter months impassable. The gratuitousness of this destruction of an ancient see, the utilitarianism of destroying a see because there was "no inconvenience," and the disregard to rights of property, which would have taken from Mann its "ewe lamb," in order to spare the flocks and herds of its wealthier neighbour, eking out the bishoprics of England and Wales by the £2000 per annum taken from Mann,† would, in itself, imply that other influences were predominant in the Commission, or that at least the presence of its new elements had transmuted the character of those who had been left in it. And the change implied by this arbitrary act is the more remarkable, in that this annexation was first proposed when Sir R. Peel was in office, in order to add the bishop's income to Carlisle, but the measure was then successfully opposed, as being *unjust*, if the revenues were alienated from the soil, and *useless*, if they were not.

The extinction of the diocese of Mann was unjustifiable on every principle of honesty, generosity, and ecclesiastical polity; it was an Erastian act, oppressing and spoiling a weaker neighbour; it re-enacted the abolition of the Irish sees, and made the English Church the spoiler. It was, however, from the nature of the case, a single instance.

Far more extensive was the case of *direct contravention to the terms of the Commission*. The Commission runs—"for considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as may render *them* most conducive to the efficiency of

\* "In assigning the boundaries of the diocese, we have adopted those fixed by an act passed in the 4th and 5th years of your majesty's reign, as comprising the metropolitan district." Many decided *disadvantages*, besides that of the vastness of the change, are well pointed out by Mr. Benson, Letter, p. 13, *sqq.*

† Letter by the late Bishop Ward to the Clergy of the Isle of Mann, Nov. 1837, p. 3.

the Established Church;" the king's Speech, as said above, pressed the same point, "to render *them*," the cathedral and collegiate churches, "most conducive;" the former Commissioners stated that they were preparing to consider this, and began, in the case of Westminster, acting upon it. The Second Commission recited the same words, and then proceeded to speak, not of the cathedrals, but of their *endowments*; to propose to render *them*, the cathedrals, "more conducive to the efficiency of the Church" by well-nigh destroying them, by abolishing at one stroke, "above 360 non-residentiary prebends, and 72, or nearly one-half of the residentiaries; to render, *e. g.* Canterbury, or Westminster, or Winchester, or Durham, more efficient, by taking away two-thirds of their residentiaries, suppressing eight out of twelve prebends. Suppress the rest, and blot out (as would soon be done) all but the memory of our cathedrals, what they did for the Church so long as politicians meddled not with them, either to corrupt or to destroy them, and you will have brought them to the very acmé of efficiency. The Commissioners seem to have borrowed a hint from the treacherous act of Medea, when she cut in pieces the aged king, limb from limb, and seethed him, and boiled up his flesh, in order to restore him to the freshness and vigour of youth.

The contradiction between the directions given by his late Majesty and this Report of the Commissioners is so obvious, that it seems strange that they should even have thought themselves entitled to enter upon the question at all,\* but that the influence of a strong bias is proverbial. Under such, the Commissioners honestly confess themselves to have acted. They admit

"We have entered upon the inquiry, which relates to cathedral and collegiate churches, under a *strong impression* that if the endowments of those bodies should appear to be larger than is requisite for the purposes of their institution, and for maintaining them in such a state of efficiency and respectability, as may enable them fully to carry those purposes into effect, the surplus of those endowments, whatever it may be, ought to be made available for the augmentation of poor benefices containing a large population, and to the great object of adding to the number of the parochial clergy."

\* It is curious to observe the way in which the Commissioners gradually change the language of the Commission in respect to the cathedrals; the Commission runs, "such measures as may render them *most* conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church," Report I. changes this (towards the close) into "by which those foundations may be made *more conducive than they now are*," &c.; but Report II. actually quotes his Majesty's words, "as may render them conducive," omitting "*most*," p. 5. The original wording cannot be acquitted of utilitarianism, as if the inquiry were altogether open, and cathedrals might be turned to account in any way which seemed expedient; but as the views of the Commissioners altered, even it was modified.

In other words, they entered upon this inquiry, not for the purpose of ascertaining whether the cathedral churches might be preserved and rendered effective for the ends which they and we have at heart,—not with any respect for the piety of their founders, or their past services, or the sacredness of trusts, or the rights of property, or the vested interests of posterity,—not with any enlarged views as to the efficiency of the Established Church, nor whether such efficiency might not be promoted in the highest degree, by these offices, if *well filled* (and for the mode in which they *have been filled*, persons in the offices of the Commissioners are accountable to the Church, and to God), nor whether it is not necessary to the healthy existence of the Church, to have such offices, nor whether she ever was without them in some form, nor (to name one point more) whether, on the narrow view which makes parochial ministers the measure of the wants of the Church, a judicious system of annexation of important cures to a certain number of these offices, might not be at least as beneficial as the melting them down into one common fund, (for even if it were only as beneficial, the most ordinary principles of sound policy would require them to be left untouched)—the Commissioners entered upon the inquiry, as they state, not with any of these views, but under the one “strong impression,” that if the cathedrals had any thing to spare, they had a right to take it; “it ought to be made available for the augmentation of poor benefices containing a large population, and to the great object of adding to the number of the parochial clergy.” The cathedral and collegiate churches may well appeal from, the Church may well mistrust, such biassed and prejudiced inquiries!

The inquiry, consequently, was soon settled. Three cathedrals were found, all in towns of small population, York, Chichester, and Carlisle, which had but a dean and four canons; therewith the “inquiry” was accomplished; a satisfactory minimum was found, by which the rest might be measured and reduced; the commissioners recommend, with apparent satisfaction,

“that the chapter in each of the churches enumerated, shall consist hereafter of a dean and four canons, the establishment at present *actually existing* in the cathedrals of York, Chichester, and Carlisle; and that the income which would have been payable to each residentiary, exceeding the number of four, shall, as the stalls become vacant, be paid to the treasurer of Queen Anne’s Bounty.”

And so, because, in ancient times, in the cathedrals in small towns, York and Chichester, all but four were allowed to be non-residents, no attention is to be paid to the will of the founder of

Wells,\* who requires that the smallest number of residents should be six ; or because at the Reformation 3500*l.* per annum alone was rescued out of the spoils of the monasteries, for the cathedral of the small city and diocese of Carlisle, therefore the metropolitan cathedral of Canterbury; or the chapter of Westminster, in the heart of our destitute and crowded capital; or Exeter, the capital of the West; or Durham, the seat of an university; or Ely, naturally and historically, and by grateful recollections connected with one, and fruitful in learned men, are to be reduced to the same level: or because in the small city of Carlisle, a somewhat larger income is divided among its residentiaries, than in the populous and important city of Bristol is distributed among *six*, therefore Carlisle is to retain its endowments, Bristol is to lose *two* of its stalls, and their endowments to be carried elsewhere; and though Carlisle is to retain its endowment, such as it is, Hereford, Salisbury, Bristol, Gloucester, Peterborough, because their founders wished their service to be more solemn, and their number of residentiaries larger, are all to be reduced to the same number as Carlisle, and their aggregate incomes considerably below it.† We do not wish to set up Carlisle as the ideal of income as well as of numbers, lest it should be the signal for fresh spoliation, such as has been spoken of; but we do contend that it is an injustice to these cities to carry their income elsewhere; and that, although Bristol, Gloucester, and Salisbury have large and ill-endowed cures, whereas had their founders divided them into the “perfect number” of four, they would still have retained it. Again, of those who attempted to realize in their institutions the number of the Apostles, and would have the very number of the residentiaries be a memento of an apostolic life, Winchester and Canterbury will be despoiled of two-thirds of their prebendaries and (the dean being for the present retained) of four-sevenths of their revenues, whereas, had the founders been less nobly ambitious in the institutions which they consecrated “to the honour of the holy and undivided Trinity,” and prescribed but six instead of twelve prebendaries, they would have been mutilated of one-third only. Again, if separate estates were left to any particular stall, such was the love of equality in

\* Memorial of the Dean and Chapter of Wells.—*Chapter Memorials*, p. 137.

† “The rule which has been actually adopted must operate unequally, because whatever be the amount of chapter endowments, and whatever be its wants, without the least reference to either the one point or the other, the portion to be abstracted is made to depend simply on the number of shares into which cathedral funds have in fact been divided; so that, assuming two cathedrals with equal revenues, if in the one, eight residentiaries had been found necessary, and had been maintained, and in the other four only, from the more efficient chapter half its means would be abstracted, and from the other nothing.”—*Exeter Memorial*, l. c. p. 86.

these Commissioners, (with the exception of two cases "reserved for further consideration,") that they were all taken away; even Chichester, with its four residentiaries, did not reach the ideal of perfection since it had separate estates amounting to 109*l.* per annum! and so, by the (we will not use a hard term, but the Commissioners' own) by the *abstraction*\* of the separate estates, it yielded 109*l.* per annum to "the fund." Happy, or as it is termed in minstrelsy "merry Carlisle" alone realized its ancient character, and remained unmutilated. Procrustes was wont to be a proverb for tyrannical proceeding; yet even he, when he stretched out or amputated the limbs of the travellers, as they fell short of, or exceeded his ideal, chose a medium standard; in these recommendations, almost the whole process is amputation.

But if in this point these second Commissioners went beyond their measure and against their instructions, in one closely connected with it they fell short of it, we mean in "Inquiry." They were directed, as they recite the terms of their Commission, to "consider the state of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches of England and Wales." As they interpreted the former instructions over-laxly, so these over-narrowly. Terms, such as these, could hardly be construed to mean that they were to look into the returns of the former Commission, which in their first Report they designate as inadequate;† examine *them* on the state of each Cathedral; see what funds were divided among its residentiaries; whether it had any non-residentiaries; what separate estates any of its members held; what might be confiscated to the general fund. It surely implied a particular inquiry into the local circumstances of each several cathedral; its relation to the city or the diocese in which it was placed; what ends it might serve relatively to those for whom it was more immediately endowed, at least the sources of its revenues; and what it owed to such places, or how it might more especially benefit those where-with it was connected. It is plain that no such inquiry was made, even for this, that as it would have been impossible that, upon inquiry, the same unbending measure of confiscation should have been applied to all, all have been mown down to one common level. The Commissioners could not so have ignored all the information which inquiry would have furnished. But, besides, it is notorious (*and we have full reason to know*) that no inquiry was

\* "Abstraction, the act of taking away one thing from another."—*Johnson's Dict.*

† "As the greater part of the Episcopal revenues arises from fines on the renewal of leases, of which some were granted for three lives, renewable when a life drops, and others for twenty-one years, renewable every seven, and in towns for forty years, renewable every fourteen, it is manifest that a period of three years is too short to exhibit a correct average of the annual value of the several sees."—*Report 1*, p. 5.

made;\* that information offered was refused; that representations were left unanswered; that no one member of a cathedral (we speak not of one who, being a bishop, was on the Commission) *no one member of a cathedral was examined, heard, or listened to.* The recommendations for the suppression of stalls, which, by the terms of the Commission, they were not empowered to make, was founded on the entire neglect of inquiry, which was the very professed object of their appointment.

Yet the Commissioners felt that they ought, by the terms of their appointment, to have made such inquiries; they admit that they ought, and they profess that they had made them, nay, and “particular inquiries.” They say,

“Having made particular inquiries concerning the constitution of these several foundations, the establishments mentioned in each, the revenues of the corporations and of their individual members, and the disposition of their corporate funds, we are now prepared to recommend such measures, as will, in our opinion, leave a sufficient provision for the proper performance of the service of the Churches, for the continual reparation and maintenance of the fabrics, and *for the other objects contemplated by the founders*, and at the same time allow the application of a considerable portion of their revenues to, &c.”

But these “particular inquiries” extended no further than into the large Report, printed by the previous “Commission of Inquiry into Ecclesiastical Revenues,” or a condensation of the statements made to them. The Appendixes, Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, to which they refer in proof of their “particular inquiries,” contain no other data than what had been furnished before by a different body, re-arranged. Yet they too had been armed with the same power of examining upon oath, if required, “any rolls, records, orders, books, papers, or other writings relating to the said cathedral and collegiate churches;” so that the advisers of this Commission contemplated no such summary process as that adopted. Such inquiry would have prevented much evil. The Commissioners declared their wish to

“leave a sufficient provision for the proper performance of the services of the churches;”

and the chapter of Carlisle, the model cathedral, would have told them that

“they feel it their duty to state that they cannot contemplate with any degree of satisfaction, the proposal for reducing the number of canons in other more richly-endowed cathedrals to the number of four, *fixed by their own statutes*; because they are, from experience, well aware that

\* This is complained of in the Memorial of Canterbury (p. 38), Exeter (p. 92), Lincoln (p. 107), Salisbury (p. 128). The chapter of Wells offers information (p. 137). Others (*e. g.* Exeter) give a good deal which was not attended to.



with that limited number it is very difficult, and often impracticable, to secure the constant attendance of one of the body at daily prayer, more especially when sickness or old age may happen to prevent individuals from fulfilling their own wishes in that respect."—*Chapter Memorials*, p. 24.

Canterbury again would have stated that  
 "we ourselves have had at the same time four prebendaries, of whom three were more than seventy years old, two of them more than eighty, and one so much an invalid that he was seldom equal to his duty; what would have been said of our 'efficiency,' if our number had been limited to those four? If we look to those cathedrals in which the number of prebendaries is four, we find that a system of proxies has been there introduced and tolerated; but the system has given rise to much calumny against cathedral institutions, even where use has rendered it familiar; and we may reasonably infer that the introduction of it at the present day, would more seriously affect the credit of chapters, whose members have been studious and careful to give their personal attendance."—*Ib.* p. 12.

Exeter, that

"in the discharge of the many and important public duties which their position in the diocese and the city brings upon them, it is the presence and co-operation of two or more canons, which alone could enable them to act with the necessary promptitude and decision."—*Ib.* p. 77.

Exeter, which is among the most efficient and well-conducted cathedrals in the Church, attests that it owes that efficiency to the *constant* residence of two or more of its prebendaries, as opposed to the modern lax system, which in consequence of these preferences being held with distant cures, too often, but not uniformly prevails, that one only should reside at once. This modern innovation the Commission took as its standard.

Ely again, that

"in compliance with the strong injunction of their statutes, they are in the constant habit of preaching to a very large congregation assembled in the body of the cathedral church. In cases of sickness and infirmity, it has been the custom for one member of the chapter to take another's duty, so that there are very few Sundays in the year when the pulpit is not occupied by the lord bishop of the diocese, the dean, or some member of the chapter; but that they are convinced that it would not be possible to maintain this part of the service upon its present footing, if the number of canons were reduced to four."

And after protesting against the inference from York and Chester, in which non-residentiaries perform a part of the duty, they maintain—

"that should the proposed reduction ever take place, it would most seriously impair the dignity, solemnity, and efficiency of those religious offices, which were ordained by their founder to be performed for ever

in the cathedral church of Ely, to the glory of Almighty God, and the welfare of the people."

Thus, like is urged by the chapters of Westminster, Windsor, and Hereford; and in another chapter, with which we happen to be acquainted, consisting of six prebendaries, two of whom have from ill health long been incapacitated from residing, how would the service be provided for, if these two shall be part of the reduced number of four? This office is in the large majority of cases retained for life, and yet it is one, which, in case of the infirmities of the holders, cannot, like parochial duties, be supplied by a curate. And therefore, perhaps, among other reasons, the founders did not fix the minimum which modern "equalizing" would adopt.

Again, the Commissioners profess to wish  
 "to leave enough for the reparation and continual maintenance of the fabric."

On this again the chapter of Salisbury would have informed them,

"that to provide for the frequent and costly repairs of their venerable cathedral, they had hitherto subjected themselves to a deduction from their annual dividends, by appropriating one-eighth to the express purpose of maintaining it in its original beauty and elegance."—*Ib.* p. 132.

The chapter of Norwich and of Christ-Church, insist upon the same point; and it were manifest, on reflection, that when the maxim should be once established, that cathedrals become "conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church" in proportion to the sums which they yield towards parochial purposes, any sums to be spent upon the maintenance of the fabric, would be first grudged, then clamoured against, then refused. Would the chapter of Canterbury have been allowed to pledge its income in order to borrow 22,000*l.* for the restoration of their beautiful fabric? Would it not have been said, (it has indeed been already said,) "Wherefore this waste? This ointment might have been sold for much and given to the poor." The principle of magnificent honouring of God, which thinks nothing too costly for His service Who gave us all, and our modern utilitarianism, are directly opposed to each other. So soon as the utilitarian principle shall be applied to cathedrals, their days are numbered; this very plea of their expensiveness has been already urged in the House of Commons,\* as a ground for pulling them down, and the proposal was heard unrebuked. The same proposal was made in times which have too many points of resemblance with the present.

\* By Mr. Hume.

"On\* the Journals may be read the following entry (9th July, 1652.)

"That it be referred to the committee to consider what cathedrals are fit to stand, and what to be pulled down, and what part thereof; and how those cathedrals, or such part thereof, as shall be pulled down shall be applied to the payment of the public faith."

It was discovered then, we believe, that the expense of pulling down these massive monuments of piety would cost more than the value of the materials, when the desolation was accomplished; and so since nothing could be obtained to relieve "the public faith," our cathedrals were allowed to stand; but time and decay are costless labourers; and it is certain that after about two-thirds of the property of a chapter has been confiscated, two-thirds would not be paid out of "the fund" resulting from the confiscations, towards any repairs of the cathedral. No! it would now become, what its founders made it to other ends, *sacrosanct*; the spoils would be regarded as the property of the parochial clergy: the remnants of the chapters might support their cathedrals, if they would, with their whole income; else a sure but heavy hand would moulder them, and after-generations would admire the ruins of Ely and Lincoln, as they do those of Tintern and Melrose; taking credit to themselves for their sympathy and taste in admiring what their penury destroyed. The state of the once beautiful cathedrals of Normandy show what will be the effects of this "abstraction" of their funds.

Lastly, the Commissioners wish, they say,

"To leave a sufficient provision for the other objects contemplated by their founders."

Here, again, inquiry would have saved what is of all the most painful, and which, considering the character and office of the Episcopal Commissioners, one least likes to touch upon. Yet the first object, that which the founders seem most prominently to have contemplated, was the inviolability of their institutions. This is just what one would suppose that a founder would contemplate; he might think that in varying times, his institution might require various subordinate modifications, (though even these he would have used sparingly, lest his institution should be made to fall in with bad times, instead of being a witness against them,) but that which founders would naturally have at heart would be, that their institutions should remain, as monuments of them; that they should, after their death, remain to carry on their designs; that they themselves should thus work on after death; that as long as the militant state of Christ's Church should endure, their

\* Prospects of England, June, 1832, an able pamphlet.

gifts and labours should be employed in the good fight. They were contented to lay the foundation of fabrics, which, while on earth, they should never see; they were content with a posthumous joy; they parted with the present, that they might gain futurity. They lived in futurity, and parting with what could be realized during life, for that which could not be completed till after life, they wished to have the whole period after their life as theirs. They wished, blending their names or their works with His, "Who alone endureth for ever," to acquire an immortality for their works, to yield an immortality of service; "they called" not "their lands after their own names," but after His, and so they hoped, that, with His, their "name also should endure for ever, their names should remain under the sun among the posterities," who (in their subordinate way) "should be blessed through them, while generation after generation, through their institutions, praised their God."

Such is the obvious wish of a founder, the integrity and inviolability of his institutions; and such the chapters would, upon inquiry, have informed them, was the expressed wish of *their* founders, and that consequently whatever additional duties might be laid upon them, it must be a first principle that the institution should remain unimpaired. The Cathedral of Ely (and their statutes are the same as many, if not all, and are the expositors of all) would have told them, that the will of their founder, as recorded in their statutes, was\*—

"To the glory and honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, we have decreed that a certain cathedral church, consisting of one dean, a presbyter, and eight prebendaries, presbyters, should be created, erected, founded, and established, *there* to serve Almighty God wholly *and for ever*; and this same cathedral church, consisting of one dean, a presbyter, and eight prebendaries, presbyters, with other ministers necessary for the worship of God, we do by the tenor of these presents really and fully create, erect, found, establish, and do by these presents command to be established and kept *inviolably for ever*; and the said dean and prebendaries we do in name and reality make, create, and establish, into one corporate body, and do make, declare, ordain and hold them as one body, and let them have a *perpetual succession*."

It was surely a part of "the constitution of these several foundations," into which the Commissioners acknowledged it to be their duty to inquire, that they *were constituted for ever*.

The more miserable part, however, remains. The several

\* We cannot, of course, look upon Henry VIII. or Elizabeth as the founders of cathedrals, which they only re-erected on the basis of similar foundations, abstaining thus far from gratifying the avarice of their courtiers; but their statutes may be looked upon as embodying the wishes of the ancient and real founders, to which these gave a civil and royal sanction.

bishops on the commission had, by themselves, or by proxy, taken the oath prescribed in their charters, that they would maintain the "rights" of the said churches. Such oaths are in tranquil times often apt to be forgotten, from the very fact, that he who takes them thinks it impossible that he *can* violate them. Had inquiry been employed, they would have been reminded that the oath bound them, not only as to any thing which they could do in their individual capacity, which is nothing, but as legislators; that they are, as they have often since been quietly and respectfully reminded, "the sworn defenders of the cathedrals," and must not, in any way, lay their hand upon them; that they may reform abuses, if any exist, but may not, under a plea of reconstructing, destroy.

The Chapter of Canterbury\* would have recalled to them, had it been allowed to speak, that—

"The care, indeed, taken of our 'rights and liberties' thus ordained, is singularly manifested in the oath which our diocesans take on their inthronization, and which binds them absolutely to maintain our rights and liberties, while it exacts but a conditional observance of our customs; for the words of the oath are, 'I swear to maintain the rights and liberties of this church, and to observe the approved customs thereof, and, as far as it concerns the archbishop, to cause the same to be observed by others, so far as such customs are not repugnant to God's word, the laws, statutes, provisions and ordinances of the realm, or to his majesty's prerogative, and not otherwise.' The language in the cap. 6 of our statutes sets forth the founder's will without any ambiguity:—'We wholly forbid the alienation or impledging of any manor, &c., for we wish our church to be in good condition, not to grow lean' (*pinguescere, non macrescere*).

"The oath prescribed in cap. 11 of our statutes, and taken by every prebendary on his admission, contains the founder's will, expressed, if possible, still more strongly.—Since, then, it is apparent that our founder has not only given to us the disposal and enjoyment of all our revenues, and by every kind of ordinance secured them to us absolutely, and without deduction for any purpose foreign to our establishment, save of one specific payment in lieu of first fruits and tenths, but that he has also confined the revenues to us, excluding all others from participating in them, and that he binds every individual member, by the strongest and most sacred ties, to resist, to the utmost of his power, all attempts that may be made to alienate or divert any portion of them, we maintain that no alienation of our revenues can be enforced by the Commissioners, without violating as well all the generally received rights of property, as the rights and liberties which are peculiarly ours."

We cannot doubt, that this consideration, which is again strongly urged in the memorial of Ely, hinted at in that of Here-

\* Memorial, l. c. p. 9.

ford and others, and conveyed in the common memorial of the delegates of chapters, would have influenced the episcopal members of the Commission; that even if they could satisfy themselves that their oath might be confined to their individual capacities (in which it now means nothing), still it would commonly be thought that an oath taken by one, *as* bishop, and on his inthronization *as* bishop, must bind him in all his episcopal functions; that great scandal would consequently be given, and great laxity as to oaths encouraged, did *they* become the very causes of destroying or impairing, did *they* recommend, and legislate, and vote for, impairing that, which they had sworn to maintain inviolate. As it was, there were no means of conveying this information to them, until the first act had been done; there was no sufficient ground (in the face of the opposite recommendation of the Commission and the first Report, as corresponding with the Commission) to suspect that any such plan was even contemplated; the Commissioners then could not but remain unwarned; they recommended these measures against the cathedrals, we are assured, unaware of their oath; the second step they have not yet taken; they have not retracted, but neither have they advanced. We are sure, could the matter have been presented to them, *re integra*, they would have seen that any confiscation of revenues was precluded to them individually, as well as by the terms of the Commission; that if it was done at all, it must be done by other hands, that *to them*, annexation of duty, or some plan which should maintain each cathedral entire and inviolate, was the only way open, whereby to make the cathedrals "most conducive to the efficiency of the Church."

In the absence, however, of all inquiry, save into the amount of the endowments of the several cathedrals, and the numbers to whom those endowments had been allotted, the process was necessarily short. The only principle of this Report and this Commission was (in its own language) to "obtain what resources" it could, for an end, good in itself, but not, if pursued by means not good, nor, in such way, likely to be blessed. Its characteristic is an utter disregard of all ancient rights and usages and laws, a forgetfulness of times past. Riveted on the present, and present needs, every thing else disappears from the sphere of their vision, but this only, how this money, or some portion of this money, may be "obtained;—rem, si possis, recte, si non, quocunque modo rem." Having fixed the cathedral of Carlisle (for York and Chichester, which they instance, have non-residentiaries) as the one model, as the ideal of a cathedral, for "carrying fully into effect the purposes of their institution;"—(The cathedral also of Carlisle as well as its chapter surely was the model upon which

the magnificent and elevated pile of Canterbury was formed, the founder of Canterbury could have had no further views than he of Carlisle;) having taken this as their maximum of cathedral magnificence, every thing else is swept away; the fifty-one non-residentiary prebends of Lincoln, "each of which, save one," (as they were afterwards reminded,) "within four hundred years, produced a bishop; and every individual cathedral in this kingdom has had a prebendary of this noble church, bishop thereof;"\* every thing, prebends, canonries, separate estates, are all "dealt with" in one and the same way, as if there were no laws but those of might, no title-deeds but those of want, no right but only will, no will of a founder, no will but of the present day.

The Commissioners decided without examining, but there must of necessity be examination after they had decided. They did not inquire before they decided, and so there must needs be subsequent inquiry, in order to adapt their decisions in any degree to existing circumstances. This is visible in every part of their Reports. And this at once rendered necessary and prepared the way for a most extensive innovation on the terms of the Commission, an institution more formidable than even the existing Commission, a permanent Corporate Commission, to be invested with the power of settling details, which the Commissioners had been in too much haste, or had not information enough, to decide upon. They had, without attention to details, with bold and unshrinking hand, sketched out the model, upon which the noble and massive structures of our forefathers were to be re-constructed, and their goodly buildings turned into petty tenements, wherein men might, if they could, find shelter. Yet, when the work of destruction was to commence, some there must be to fit together the broken shafts and capitals into the rude walls of the new structure. In a word, the Commissioners had, with regard to both parts of their subject, the arrangement of dioceses, and the spoliation of chapters, settled *what* was to be done, or rather undone, but they had, through lack of information, settled little or nothing as to *how* it was to be done.

Beginnings are generally slight; and so, in this second Report, this new body is but indistinctly hinted at. The first sketch of it is thus drawn with reference to the remodelling of dioceses;†—

"Minor objections have been made to other parts of the proposed territorial divisions of dioceses, which it is not necessary now to specify;

\* Willis's Hist. of Cathedrals, quoted in Lincoln Memorial, l. c. p. 111.

† Rep. 2, p. 2.

for, with regard to this, and indeed to *most of the measures*, which, in the discharge of our duty, we have recommended, or may have to recommend, to your majesty, it will be requisite, for the purpose of carrying them fully into effect, that permanent authority should be vested in some persons, to be named in any act of parliament which may be passed for sanctioning those measures; who may be *capable of inquiring into details*, more fully than would be convenient for your majesty in council, with whom, we apprehend, the ultimate sanction will vest."

Transferring population from one diocese to another seemed to have little difficulty. Our episcopal system had already been so weakened by the neglect or positive offences of the government since the Revolution, that the laity are in many cases hardly conscious under what bishop they live; they think of him as one who has to direct the discipline and often the appointments of the clergy, and so is indirectly concerned with them; or they do value the graces of an individual as an eminent ecclesiastic: but, further, they do not conceive that they live in any special relation to him. In the clergy it might seem want of respect to the bishop to whom they were to be transferred, to raise any objection to the change; and, besides, they believed that it had the common sanction of the whole body of the bishops. However this may be, except when men were to be altogether deprived of a bishop, the transfer was made without opposition or difficulty; not so revenue and money. Here, as soon as details began to be investigated, difficulties were seen, which the expeditious presentment of the said Report had given no time even to glance at. They discovered\* that—

"The peculiar manner of leasing the episcopal estates throws great difficulties in the way of carrying into effect the arrangement suggested in our First Report. If the estates were let at rack rents, so that each bishop might receive every year about that which is stated to be his average annual income, it would be easy, upon the occurrence of a vacancy in one of the richer sees, to require the future bishop to pay a certain annual sum towards the augmentation of the poorer sees. But the great variation which occurs in the episcopal incomes from year to year, according as a greater or less amount of fines is received, presents an obvious difficulty."

Thus then a more complex expedient became necessary than that recommended in the First Report; they had, it seems, gone upon a rough estimate of the episcopal incomes, and had not even taken into account, what from their own experience they must have well known, that the annual income of each see varies very considerably, and that therefore the payments to be made by

\* Report 2, p. 3.



the "richer sees" must be very irregular. This variation, although not much felt now, when bishops are allowed to hold commendams, would be felt very sensibly, if any great variation were to take place in the reduced income of from 4000*l.* to 5000*l.* This consideration produced difficulties, amid which the Commissioners in the Second Report seem to toss to and fro, throwing out a suggestion or two, but with no very definite prospect of its holding or mooring them safely; so that again this new undefined "body" is called in. To meet these exigencies, it is suggested, that the ordinary expedient of bankrupts must be resorted to.

"The reversions of some estates may perhaps be advantageously sold. Such sales can now be effected only under the authority of an act of parliament: we would therefore suggest the expediency of giving power to effect them, under certain restrictions, and with the consent of *the body to which we have referred.*"

It is important to notice this change of tone in the two Reports. Rep. 1. speaks of "*enabling* the incumbents of the richer sees to pay, &c." Rep. 2. of "*requiring* of the future bishop;—the sums *to be deducted* from the income of a future bishopric;" so that it is no longer an arrangement of the bishops among themselves, but a compulsory regulation from without, which they who made, might re-make as they pleased. But, beyond this, a power is to be given of selling episcopal estates, *with the consent*, not of the bishops whose they are or were, but of *the body referred to.* If so, *the independence of the bishops is gone.*

A further invasion of the authority of the bishops, and enlargement of the powers of this body, is prepared in the recommendations with regard to pluralities and the union of smaller benefices; but still undefined. It was suggested that certain cases of pluralities may be allowed upon statements made by the bishop to the archbishop, and transmitted, with his sanction, to the *privy council.* "The union of two benefices," it is said,—

"May now be done, under certain restrictions, *by the bishop*, with the consent of the patron. But there exists a degree of uncertainty as to the circumstances under which it can be legally done, which it is desirable to remove by a more strict and precise limitation."

And how is this done? One should have thought that the natural remedy, instead of a more precise limitation, would have been to have put greater confidence in, and give greater latitude to, the bishops. The remedy as to the *union* of benefices (remarkably enough) is not even hinted at in this Report, except by the juxta-position of a provision that the "*separation* of unions shall be effected by his majesty in council, on the *recommendation* of the bishop, certified by such Commissioners as may be appointed

for the purposes connected with this Report." The Plurality-bill, recently introduced, furnishes, however, a comment, and transfers the whole, union and dis-union, and the alteration of the boundaries of parishes, to the "standing Commission." But of this hereafter.

Further powers for this new permanent Commission are provided by the indefiniteness of the propositions with regard to the cathedrals. Up to a certain point the measures are definite enough; the confiscation of every thing in every cathedral, except the corporate revenues of a dean and four canons, (even their separate endowments are to be forfeited) "at one fell swoop," is unhappily plain enough; but what shall be done with the spoils, or with the yet unspoiled fragments of the cathedrals, remained undecided. It is easy to pull down, but not to build up. The Commissioners propose *one* scheme of disposing of this surplus; state, over against each other, the "sum required to augment all benefices of a certain population and income according to a proposed scale;"\* and what can be extracted by the proposed confiscation of stalls.† But they subjoin that they

"Are far from intending that an inference should be drawn from this statement, as to our opinion respecting the best mode of distributing the sum, whatever it may be, which will be derived from the adoption of the propositions which we are about to offer. The question as to the *general principles of distribution* requires the most serious consideration, and much additional inquiry; and we must reserve, for the present, any distinct recommendation."

Thus then the Commissioners had decided how much they would take from the cathedrals, *i. e.* that they would take all which could be taken, without having settled even the "general principles of distribution:" this required the "most serious consideration and *much* additional inquiry;" and yet but a little additional inquiry might have shown, (as we shall hereafter show,) that more might be done for this very end by preserving the chapters than by destroying them. But we cannot sufficiently deprecate this way of disarming all opposition to the plunder of the cathedral, by exhibiting that others want and that they have; the very argument which revolutionists continually employ against all property, and more, hitherto, against that of such as the Commissioners, lay as well as ecclesiastic, than against the cathedrals. But if this be full of evil in any case, much more when the cupidity to be roused is that of men who ought most to be free from covetousness, the large body of the clergy. It was inexcusable to bring forward a plan unmaturing, and incapable of

\* Report 2, p. 6, and App. No. 2.

† Ib. p. 10, and App. Nos. 4, *sqq.*

being matured, by which 2971 clergy might be led to speculate how much of the spoils of the cathedrals might fall to their share; and since this was one plan only, not only they, but various other classes of the clergy, were taught to look upon the destruction of the cathedrals as a benefit to them.\* This is no imaginary case; among a large body of men it could hardly be otherwise; Scripture prohibits to take "a gift to *blind* thine eyes withall;" and we have met with those whose eyes have been thus blinded. It were unstatesman-like, thus to raise uncertain expectations, which, on their own showing, cannot be satisfied; to pull institutions to pieces without settling what to raise in their stead; to carry through one half of a plan, and reserve for future "most serious consideration and additional inquiry" the other half upon which it is dependent; but it is worse than this, it is unholy, thus to tempt those "in whose mouth is the law of truth" (Mal. ii. 6), to break the law, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house—nor any thing that is his."

The other point with regard to cathedrals, which *could* be settled, was the employment of the remaining stalls. The Report sets out with stating that the Commissioners

"Are now prepared to recommend such measures as will, in our opinion, leave a sufficient provision for the proper performance of the services of the churches, for the continual reparation and maintenance of the fabrics, and for the other objects contemplated by the founders."

And so it would be thought that at least the stalls saved out of the wreck would have been sacred for the objects contemplated by the founder; that pious learning or clerical education, or a tranquil and intercessory devotion, or contemplative piety, might at least have found a refuge in this remainder.† At least,

\* Notwithstanding the protest above quoted, there seemed considerable probability that the plan which the Commissioners took so much pains to exhibit in detail, setting forth the sums which would accrue to the parochial clergy in every diocese, according to the proposed scale, was *the* plan then uppermost in their mind. At least, they distinguish the benefices in private from those in public patronage, (App. 2,) state, that the latter would, "in the first instance, be the preferable objects of assistance from the fund;" (page 5,) calculate how much those in public patronage would require, on this scale, and show that the sum total would be 145,195*l.* per annum, which curiously harmonizes with the sum which it was proposed to "abstract" from the cathedrals and sinecure rectories, above 130,000*l.* per annum. Lord John Russell, a Commissioner, drew this very parallel, in the debate, July 19, 1836, as a proof of what was to be done for poor livings. "There is a scale established, by which livings of less than 150*l.*, with a population under 1000, are to be raised to 150*l.*" &c., (Mirr. of Parl. 2464.) Sufficient uncertainty, however, was left to give some hopes for some livings in private patronage.

† "Archbishop Leighton thought it the *great and fatal error* of the Reformation, that more of those [religious] houses, and of that course of life, free from the entanglements of vows, and other mixtures, was not preserved. So that the Protestant Churches had neither places of education nor retreat for men of mortified tempers." Burnet's History of his Own Times, vol. i. p. 139. See other extracts from Cranmer and others, in "Prospective and Past Benefits of Cathedral Institutions, by E. B. Pusey," pp. 85, sqq. 2d ed.

what is so much wanted, in the wilderness of our larger dioceses, some intermediate officers, a link\* between the bishop and the parochial clergy, might have been provided; some who, having larger leisure for mature thought, should at once fulfil the primitive duty of being a council to the bishop, and solve the difficulties which are continually embarrassing the younger clergy.† So, probably, the Commissioners thought and meant at first; but having once allowed themselves to think the cathedral property at their disposal, as they go on, they open this question also.‡

“With respect to some of the better endowed canonries, which will remain in four or five of the cathedrals, we are of opinion, that they may be advantageously connected with the parochial charge of populous districts. The method of effecting this, we reserve for our future consideration; it being necessary to examine carefully the case of each cathedral, with reference to its revenues and local circumstances.”

So then, again, it appears, on their own showing, which we know from other sources, and which indeed the members of chapters represented to them, that this sweeping destruction of ancient institutions was resolved upon without “examining carefully the case of each cathedral.” Had examination preceded, instead of following, the result would have been very different. But now (as by the judge of old) the cathedrals are sentenced first, tried afterwards; the thing to be done is decided upon unhesitatingly and without knowledge of the case; all the difficulties in doing it are made over to the permanent Commission; they are to do it as they *can*, and, as a compensation, have the full power of doing it *as they like*, plenipotentiaries and irresponsible. And herein the unhappiness of the one false step taken as to the stall of Westminster is apparent; for this was done at least with some notice; but the permanent and irresponsible Commission have thus received a precedent, of subdividing stalls as they please. If a stall may be divided into two, no further principle is involved in dividing it into twenty; and so it will be fully in the power of this Commission to “pulverize the (remaining) stalls,” employing each to eke out any given number of petty stipends of 30*l.* per annum, such as the habit of this day affords as endowments. This is in their power, and it is but in the natural course of things, that on the principle of this Commission it should sooner or later

\* This is well insisted on in the “General Memorial” of the chapters, and in those from Exeter and Lincoln.

† See some good hints as to the uses of a well-appointed cathedral clergy, in “Are Cathedral Institutions useless?” Some points mixed up as to societies, charities, &c. seem questionable, because our charities and large societies are for the most part at present on so utterly un-church a plan. The importance of cathedrals, in point of learning, is the main subject of a valuable memorial from Winchester; it is urged also more or less in those from Bristol, Ely, Oxford, Worcester, Westminster, Exeter, Lincoln.

‡ Report 2, p. 11.

be done. And this is an especial mischief of a permanent Commission, that it thus affords a means of carrying out endlessly a system, which those in authority are, at present, but partially prepared to adopt. It is a continued dropping, whose proverbial power will wear away the most enduring rocks.

This destruction of stalls furnished the occasion of another exceeding of the Commission, the transfer of—(we can hardly write the word *patronage*, it is so connected with the sordid trading notions of the day, whereby trusts are regarded as rights, and rights measured by a mere estimate of profit and loss)—the transfer of the appointments hitherto invested in the chapters from them to the bishops.

These appointments are of two sorts; first, “by a custom\* prevailing in most of the cathedrals of the old foundations, the residentiaries are elected by the chapter from among the other prebendaries, who are in all cases appointed by the bishop.” These appointments the Report recommended “should henceforth be made directly by the bishop.” Why? why should the electors be changed, simply because the individuals out of whom the election is to be made is changed? Some alteration was necessary, if the non-residentiaries were to be abolished: but why not leave the election in the hands in which it had been placed, even if they, from whom the selection was to be made, must be different? And yet, in the majority of cases, according to *this* Report, the non-residentiaries would have been spared; for all were to be spared, “the income of which was little more than nominal,” and these, it was thought, “it might be expedient to retain, as marks of distinction to be bestowed upon deserving clergymen.”†

The other class of appointments is, that of benefices in the gift of the chapters. The Commissioners say,—

“The alterations, which we have proposed, with respect both to the arrangement of dioceses, and the constitution of deans and chapters, appear to us to render it *expedient* that a change should be made in the exercise of the patronage which is now vested in the last-mentioned bodies. We recommend that such regulations *should* be adopted, as may leave it in the power of deans and chapters, under certain restrictions, to give preferment to the members of their own body, and to the minor canons, who may reasonably look to them for reward after a certain period of service: and that where the presentation to any benefice in their gift is not required for these purposes, it should pass, in some cases to the crown, and in others to the bishop of the diocese in which either the cathedral or the benefice may be respectively situate.”

\* “This (the direct appointment by the bishop) is a change in their fundamental constitution. The chapter of Exeter was *always* an elective chapter.”—*Memorials*, p. 78.

† Rep. 2, p. 10.

This "expediency," the Fourth Report places in the

"Strengthening *by all possible means* the connexion between the bishop and the clergy of his diocese, and so proposes to transfer to the hands of the respective bishops the remainder of the chapter livings, as an addition to the means which they already possess, of placing laborious and deserving clergymen in situations of usefulness and independence."

But among many other "possible means of strengthening that connexion," we should have doubted the "expediency" of one, viz. WRONG and ROBBERY. Whatever benefit might have accrued, had the livings been placed originally in the hands of the bishops, (and we are not here concerned with the question in whose hands they had originally been best placed,) nothing but disgrace would result from such a violent transfer. It was a sorry exhibition to see a Commission, of which the ecclesiastical members were bishops, transfer to their own order what belonged to another, and take "from one what is his and give it to another whose it is not."\* But this whole plea of "strengthening the connexion of the bishops and their clergy," is an after-thought of the fourth Report; for the second recommended, that the presentation "should pass *in some cases to the crown*, in others to the bishop of the diocese;" so that the Commissioners (one part, by "custom" against right, disposing of the patronage of the crown, the others being bishops,) legislated as joint spoilers for themselves or for their order. The first notion (as the distribution between the crown and the bishops shows) was a mere *quid pro quo*, a compensation, a mere balance sheet of profits and losses. If the stalls are to be destroyed, there will be so much direct patronage lost to the bishops or the crown, and so it must be made up, was the principle of this change. It might have been thought that if these sweeping confiscations *were* a good to the Church, the crown and the bishops might well be content to submit to their share of privation; or that if chapters were such useless, incorrigible bodies, the bishops and the crown sustained no great loss in ceasing to nominate; at any rate, good is best purchased by some suffering; or, at the lowest, since the spoils were in the first instance to be distributed among livings in public *patronage*, they might have been contented with the indirect return, to be made to them through the augmentation of their livings. But no! upon the principle observable throughout these Reports, whereby patronage and the rights of patrons are the standard of measurement, the patrons' interests were to be secured; nothing which concerned them was to be risked or touched, and so the chapters were stigmatized, and their influence further impaired, in order to

\* General Chapter Memorial, p. 4.

secure the crown and the bishops from the loss of patronage. The exchange, like the rest of their acts, is often a sweeping and a very uneven one;\* but it was not the character of the Commission to stop at details. By the change in the fourth Report, however, a new principle was brought in by a side wind; the ground of compensation was abandoned; the crown was to look, for its return, to the improvement of its livings, but it was "expedient, by all possible means, to strengthen the connection between the bishop and his clergy." Be it so: be it that it is better that all should resign their patronage into the hands of the bishops, (and we should be glad to see, in private patrons, this mark of confidence in their bishops,) yet the principle is pernicious, that because a thing were a good, if done, therefore it is a good to do it any how; it is very dangerous to see great principles and precedents creeping in thus stealthily.

\* The following is a balance sheet of profit and loss in the patronage of those who have at present the nomination to stalls. It is apparent that nothing can compensate to the Bishop of Durham, e.g. patronage the highest of its kind in the Church, while in Carlisle, on *this* estimate of loss and gain, all is gain to the patron and no loss. From the gain is to be deducted such livings as the remaining canons would be allowed to take to themselves, (if unprovided for,) or to bestow on the minor canons; if the plan of annexation, proposed in the fourth Report, was carried out, the former class would be 0, for the canons would already have the livings annexed to their stalls.

PATRONAGE.	Loss.		GAIN.		
	Resid.	Non-Resid.	Benefices.	Alternate.	Canons Resid.
Canterbury .....	8		26	7	
York .....		24	19		4
London .....		26	34	11	1
Durham .....	8		39		
Winchester .....	8		19		
Bath and Wells .....		42	19		4
Bristol .....	2		33		
Carlisle .....	0		29		
Chester .....	0		11		
Chichester .....		29	18	2	4
Ely .....	4		18		
Exeter .....		15 of £20.	48		4
Gloucester .....	2		20		
Hereford .....		23	22		
Lichfield and Coventry	2	18	9		
Lincoln .....		43	37		1
Norwich .....	2		42		
Peterborough .....	2		7		
Rochester .....	2		30		
Sarum .....		35	16	2	
Worcester .....	6		36	1	

According to Report 4, the Archbishop of Canterbury loses 1 stall, the Bishops of Bristol, Gloucester, (or rather the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol,) Norwich, Rochester, Worcester, lose nothing, but have the preferment of the chapters assigned to them on the new principle, as would, we suppose, the 25 benefices of Westminster to the Bishop of London, and the 55 of Windsor to the Bishop of Oxford.

The whole subject, however, of patronage, as treated in these Reports, is an illustration of the tendency of any Commission, to form employment for itself, and transgress the bounds prescribed to it. The subject of patronage formed no part of the Commission issued; the Commissioners had no more right to treat upon it, than upon alterations in the Liturgy, or any other subject which reformers have thought for the benefit of the Church. Regarded as a *trust*, the four surviving canons could exercise it as well as the more flourishing body, of which they were to be the remnant and representatives; regarded even as patronage, they had the less temptation, by reason of their very fewness, to pervert it to selfish purposes. The very regulations under which a portion was left, as well as the withdrawal, sanctioned the principle, that it was given, or was to be used, for selfish ends; they went on that "truck, barter, and exchange" justice, which regards patronage as a privilege, not as a duty, as a matter of private advantage to the individuals, as a provision. On such a principle it was rightly accounted that the diminished chapters would need a diminished number of livings to bestow upon themselves, and so as if to guide them so to do, livings enough were left them to supply themselves with, and take their choice of; and the most objectionable sort of nomination, that of virtual self-nomination, was recognized, and, as it were, recommended to them. They were enjoined almost to bestow the best of the livings upon themselves; they were enjoined to bestow them upon the subordinate members of the cathedral; but they were prohibited from bestowing them upon such, as they have hitherto very frequently bestowed them upon, deserving persons not connected with themselves. The chapters were to be accustomed to bestow the livings upon their own members, but if any member or members of a chapter were contented to remain as they were, then they were to be prohibited from bestowing them upon any deserving clergyman; they were to satisfy themselves, if they pleased, but they were stigmatized as unfit to be the channel of bestowing a benefit on others. But further, what excuse was there for transferring the nomination in those cathedrals, whose numbers were yet undiminished? Was it an object with the Commissioners, that no sort of "vested right," (we speak of rights "vested" in bodies, not according to the selfish notion which would limit it to individuals,)—was it a principle that no right attached to the Church should remain undisturbed? The subject is one which it is miserable to dwell upon, but it illustrates how such an institution as the Commission gradually absorbs into itself subjects foreign to its appointment.



There yet remains one subject to be mentioned, indicative of the entire change of plan between the conservative and what might justly be called the destructive Commission. The alteration was, at the same time, in contravention to the plain meaning of the terms of the powers given to them. It was (as above said) a prominent and the best feature of that Commission, that bishops should endow out of the property of their sees the populous and poorly endowed curacies and vicarages of which they had the impropriations; this was just and right; the impropriations were given to ecclesiastical persons or bodies with that very *condition* of supplying the spiritual wants of the places which gave them; the very possession implies a duty; and the facilities of fulfilling it had been much enlarged by a valuable act procured by the chief Ecclesiastical Commissioner, (1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45,) commonly called "The Archbishop of Canterbury's enabling Act." This plan has also advantages, as we shall show hereafter, which no other plan has; it had been held out to the inhabitants of North Wales as a ground for giving up one of their bishops:—

"That so a part of the impropriations, which constitute nearly the whole property of the bishoprics, might be applied to the poor and populous vicarages of the united diocese."

It was recommended on this ground, that

"There should be annexed to some of the poorer bishoprics certain cathedral preferments, particularly in the chapters of St. Paul's and Westminster, on account of their position in the metropolis,"

a plan which has been virtually acted upon from time immemorial without any disadvantage; yet now, either because it was a more compendious process, and required less delay and examination, or from some theory of destroying commendams altogether, (although the only objectionable commendams are those specified in the Commission "*commendams with cure of souls*"); or lest the beautiful symmetry of the new-modelled chapters with their dean and four canons only should be disturbed, this plan is abandoned, the vicarages left to take their share as they might out of the confiscated cathedrals, and the whole income of Bangor transferred from Wales to the Commissioners' English Episcopal Fund.\*

\* The extent of change produced in the plan of the Commission, by this one innovation, may be inferred from the fact, that in 1836 all the poorer bishoprics, (except Peterborough, which was held with the Margaret professorship of divinity, Cambridge,) viz. Bristol, Carlisle, Chester, Exeter, Gloucester, Hereford, Llandaff, Oxford, Rochester, St. David's, were held with cathedral preferment. According to the return of the Commissioners their respective net incomes, as provided by these annexations, were as follows:—Bristol, 3564*l.*; Carlisle, 4456*l.*; Chester, 7166*l.*; Exeter, 6167*l.*; Gloucester, 3414*l.*; Hereford, 3730*l.*; Llandaff, 6418*l.*; Oxford, 3392*l.*; Rochester,

This was unjust; we contend, every other question apart, that no right existed anywhere to transfer one 6*d.* of the Archbishop of Canterbury's income to other bishoprics, until the "poor and populous vicarages," of which the archiepiscopal see is impropiator, were adequately provided for. His grace might dispense it as he pleased; but these places are his grace's heirs; and any transfer of the property of the see elsewhere, was to deprive them of their natural inheritance. His grace had, by virtue of his own Act, done this, as occasion offered; yet, as far as the "Ecclesiastical Revenues Commission" may be trusted, when carried fully into effect, there had been no surplus to spare. The same holds most strongly, on their own showing, of Bangor and St. Asaph; it holds, in its degree, of most of the rest,—Durham, Ely, Winchester, Worcester, Bath and Wells; there was no right anywhere, the whole Church had no right, to withdraw one 6*d.* of their revenues, until they had supplied all the spiritual wants of the places whose tithes they held. We should say further, the bishop, as he appoints, so is he the centre of the mission of, his clergy; he holds the common funds,\* so it is for him to fill up the unoccupied ground, and, as the delegate of the Lord of the harvest, in His name to send forth fresh labourers into the harvest. We should therefore contend again that there was no right to abstract one 6*d.* from the revenue of Durham, or London, or Winchester, for other bishoprics, so long as there was one desolate parish unprovided with a curate, much more with the tens of thousands in the bishop of Winchester's suburban, or the Bishop of London's metropolitan, districts, or the collieries of the north.†

This departure from the first Report was also, as was said, a departure from the instructions of the Commission under which they acted. This directed them "to the prevention of the necessity of attaching by commendams to bishoprics, benefices *with*

2945*l.*; St. David's, 9063*l.*; in all 50,266*l.* of which 29,445*l.* was derived from their cathedral preferments. Rather more than 4-7ths of the virtual income of these eleven, which are all the poorer, sees save one, was thus at once withdrawn. And these annexations had been made not, on the whole, accidentally, but on a system, as appears, in that one other bishopric only was held with cathedral preferment, viz. Lichfield and Coventry with a prebend of Westminster, which made its income 5564*l.* In 1836, four bishops were prebends of Westminster, and two provided for by preferment in St. Paul's, so that the plan of Report 1, which was thus broken up, was taken from actual practice. (In calculating the above bishoprics, except in the case of St. David's, in which it is expressly stated that the average given cannot be depended upon in future, the future estimated income has been taken as given in Report 2, since the average of three years is obviously of no value.)

\* See Bingham's Antiq. 9. 8. 6.

† This was rightly contended for, though mixed up with some objectionable positions, by the liberal members for the county, as is thankfully acknowledged by Archdeacon Thorpe, Charge, p. 10, but opposed by the ministry and the conservatives.

*cure of souls;*" and thereby this "does\*" in fact naturally lead the mind to the consideration of the deaneries and chapters, as the means through which an annexation may be effected, when such benefices are withdrawn."

It is plain, in fact, that in objecting to "commendams *with* cure of souls," it was intended (as the first Commissioners understood their Commission) to convey that "commendams *without* cure of souls" were unobjectionable; yet, in this Report, the arrangements as to the bishoprics are, through this alteration, wholly changed, without any hint being given that the Commissioners were proceeding upon an altered plan. The new Commissioners seem to have regarded themselves, as (which they have been designated†) "those to whom is committed the re-adjustment of the discipline and revenues of the church;" and to have regarded the Commission as a mere formal act, which should give them powers, but, in giving, could not restrain them. This was natural; they went into the Commission with their views unsettled; reform generates reform; and as they became gradually inured to each successive reform, they forgot (as men are wont to do) the point whereat they started; they glided insensibly from one to the other, until the scene was altogether shifted, without their perceiving how far they had wandered. So it ever is; it is always instructive, after a few years of reform, to look back upon the language, and principles, and maxims, which were current a little before: they bear a different stamp; they set out with different assumptions; they imply a different train of ideas to have been familiar to men's minds; people do not wilfully part from what they held, but they glide downwards. The Commissioners did not, we are sure, wilfully transgress their Commission; but summer melts imperceptibly into autumn, and autumn passes gradually into winter, and the days shorten, unfelt save at intervals. In moral as in physical nature, transitions are unmarked at the time, and may be easily overlooked, wide as the difference in the end is. This is not said, then, to blame the Commissioners, but as a warning, how little permanence of character would belong to a Permanent Commission.

And now it may be well to exhibit in a tabular form, the variations between the Reports of the Commission in its two stages, with a Conservative and Whig administration, and between the latter and the Commission itself.

\* Newman's Suffragan Bishops, p. 7.

† First Visitation Charge of the Archdeacon of Bristol, p. 15, ap. Dr. Spry, p. 34.

## COMMISSION.

To consider the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales,(1) with reference to the amount of their revenues,(2) and the more equal distribution of episcopal duties, and the prevention of the necessity of attaching by commendam to bishoprics benefices *with cure of souls*.(3)

And also considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with a view to the suggestion of such measures, as may render *them* (4) most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church.

And *for the better enabling you to fulfil the objects of this our Commission*, we do by these presents give and grant to you, or any three or more of you, full power and authority to call before you such persons(5) as you shall judge necessary, by whom you may be the better informed on the subjects herein submitted for your consideration.

And our further will and pleasure is, that you or any three or more of you do and shall, with all convenient speed,(6) report to us your opinions as to what measures it would be convenient to adopt on the several points *herein* submitted to your consideration.(7)

## REPORT I.

(2) Leaves the apportionment of the revenues (about which the Commission was silent) to the bishops themselves.

(3) Removes commendams *with cure of souls*; leaves, as before, commendams *without cure of souls*, with a view to "give back the impropriations in whole or in part to poor and populous parishes."

(4) Annexes to a stall of Westminster the cure of a large parish, dividing the parish into two, and prospectively three; suggests the union of others with bishoprics, for the object No. 3.

(5) "We have used our best endeavours to learn the opinions of the several bishops, respecting these proposed arrangements as far as they affect the respective dioceses, and have availed ourselves of many suggestions which their local knowledge enabled them to supply."

(6) Recommends in six weeks a plan for remodelling all the dioceses of England and Wales.

(7) Confined to the subjects of the Commission.

## REPORT II.

(1) Suppresses the bishopric of Sodor and Mann.

(2) Makes the payment compulsory upon the bishops and the bishops dependant and proposes to sell their estates without their consent.

(3) Abolishes commendams without cure of souls also, and so prevents augmentation of cures whereof the bishoprics have the tithes.

(4) Reduces the cathedrals to a dean and four canons, and takes away the revenues of the confiscated stalls, and the separate estates of the remaining.

(5) Declines the information offered by the chapters, and invites no one—reserves all especial consideration of each cathedral to a future time, and for a future Commission.

(6) Gives (as well as Report 1) imperfect recommendations, and recommends the establishment of a *permanent* Commission, i. e. of themselves as a *permanent* corporate body.

(7) Recommends suppression of bishopric of Sodor and Mann, of majority of cathedral stalls, dispensation with statutes and oaths therewith connected, dissolution of all colleges and corporations of minor canons, restraining the patronage of chapters to themselves or dependants, and transfer of the rest to the crown or the bishop, of all which there is nothing in the Commission.

*The Third Report* was a supplement to the first on the change in bishoprics, as the fourth was to the second on the confiscation of chapters. They are principally occupied in details, giving the "further remarks" of the Commissioners on those subjects. The third bore date May 20, 1836, the fourth June 24. It was supplementary, accordingly, or corrective of a Report, which had been presented rather more than three months before.

They contain no new principle, but they possess a melancholy interest in showing how soon persons become familiarized to those which they have half adopted. They possess a higher, though still more melancholy, interest in that they show how much good feeling was yet left in the country, which might have been called forth, and would have readily answered the call, but which, in the panic of those years, or in the ignorance of its existence, was neglected by the Commissioners and stifled. It is very interesting to observe the difficulties which the Commissioners met at every step in destroying or suppressing a bishopric. One object proposed apparently was to get rid of the bishopric of Bristol, in order to make way for that of Ripon, so that no question about the bishops' seats in the House of Lords might be moved, the number of bishops remaining the same as before. The first Report presented two plans.

"1st, to unite it with Gloucester; which involved this objection, that the great and populous city of Bristol would no longer be the residence of a bishop, 2d, with Llandaff, though it could not be denied that the interposition of the Bristol Channel between the two parts of the diocese will produce *some* inconvenience."

The second plan was recommended as the lesser of two evils. Before the Second Report, however, the members of the diocese of Llandaff (whom there had been before no time to consult) remonstrated, "and the representations operated so strongly on the minds of the Commissioners, as to induce them, on reconsideration, to relinquish that plan." They, therefore, recommended that the diocese of Bristol should be further divided, the city and suburbs of Bristol to be united with Bath and Wells, the rest with Gloucester. In the month, however, which elapsed before the Third Report, the Commissioners

"learned that this proposition occasioned *much dissatisfaction* to the inhabitants of the city of Bristol, who have represented, in strong terms, their objections to a plan which would merge their episcopal see in that of Bath and Wells, and *their earnest desire to retain the advantages of the pastoral superintendence and example of a bishop resident among them.*"

So then the Commissioners recurred, at last, to the first alternative, and united Bristol and Gloucester, making, however, the

concession that a second house should be built near Bristol, and a larger income in consequence allotted to the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Would that this experience could have opened the eyes of the Commissioners, and instead of shifting from post to post, presenting the strange spectacle of bishops devising expedients to get rid of a bishopric, and baffled, at each essay, by the desire of laymen to retain it,—would that they had fixed the feeling which still lasts, and looking not to the clamours of infidels and republicans, congregated in our large towns, where the Church has neglected them, but to churchmen, had retained a bishop for Bristol instead of making it a sort of half-bishopric! It were, of course, the wisdom of the Church to extend herself wherever she conveniently can, to make her offices and her existence vividly present to people's minds, to lay hold of all their instinctive feelings, and, through attachment to herself, wherever such attachment exists, win men's hearts to the acknowledgment and love of Him, Whose body she is. It was, then, a strange and sad reversal of her natural and instinctive policy, to withdraw herself where she had existing attachments and antient recollections, where she was identified with the reformation; to retire from a city, whose troubles at least have made it cling still more to her—to shake it off and retreat from a place where she had been received and lodged; to retreat instead of advancing.

The Third Report however made some advances upon the foregoing, chiefly in regard to the "permanent Commission." In Report II. it is called "some persons to be named by act of parliament," p. 2; "the body to which we have referred," p. 4; "whatever body be appointed," p. 5; but these circumlocutions were only necessary to introduce this new power to the Church, and familiarize people to it. In Report III. it is every where boldly set out and at length, "whatever shall be determined by the Commissioners;" "that the Commissioners should have the power of recommending;" "a new return of the revenues of each see should be made to the Commissioners;" "that the Commissioners should be empowered," *passim*.

The (existing) Commissioners had by this time discovered, that the object for which they received their commission was impracticable, at least by *them*, on their plan, with their information, and with their rate of deliberation. They, or such of them as were concerned in the Report, (for most only assented to it,) had sketched with a rapid and bold hand an outline for equalizing the duties and incomes of bishoprics; but details ever revenge themselves upon those who neglect them; they had not been taken into account before, and so they would obstinately insist on

being regarded now: and since this was inconvenient, this new standing Commission was devised, to which every thing requiring knowledge of details was made over, gently at first, as one setting out on his travels is wont to begin by laying softly and smoothly into his valise, the things which he cannot otherwise dispose of, until at last it is filled and swelled with the heterogeneous contents usually assigned to it.

Thus the contrivance of dividing the episcopate between Gloucester and Bristol involved the novel arrangement of having two chapters to one bishopric; and as the inhabitants of Bristol might have the same partiality for their chapter as for their bishop, the simple expedient of blotting out the chapter of Bristol was not resorted to. But some acts of the bishop require to be confirmed by the chapter! By which then was this to be done, or by both, or by neither? The matter is made over from the Commissioners *in esse* to those *in posse*, and these were to "determine the mode of confirming such acts, subject to the approval of his majesty in council." The chapters, of course, were not to be consulted. The precedent would have been bad.

Alterations, again, were re-made in the new-modelled or new made dioceses of Carlisle, Ripon, Manchester, Gloucester, and Worcester; and these changes were enough to show the Commissioners that many more might be required; this power, therefore, also of re-modelling the boundaries of dioceses was made over to the Commissioners *in posse*.

The incomes of the bishoprics could be still less settled than their boundaries; and certainly, from authentic accounts which we have received, great injustice would have been done to the contributing bishops, had their payments been fixed permanently, on such data, or rather absence of adequate data, as the Commissioners possessed when they arranged them. Besides this, the symptoms of the bankruptcy which has since overtaken the Commission, gleam through the third Report. Report 1 stated their

"Opinion that when the annual income of a bishop amounts to 4500*l.* it is not necessary to make any addition, nor would we recommend any diminution *unless it exceed 5,500*l.**

But Bath and Wells was calculated at 5,500*l.*; accordingly even in Report II. it escapes schedule B.; but the six weeks which had since elapsed, had discovered some defalcation of revenue; so without formally withdrawing Report I., Report III. places Bath and Wells among the bishoprics to be reduced. In Report II., to give a clearer view of the financial part of the subject, the present incomes of the larger sees, and the proposed reductions, "had been given in a tabular form," so that there

could be no mistake. Yet six weeks afterwards it is found necessary to "abstract" 600*l.* per annum, afterwards 1100*l.* from York, 700*l.* more from Worcester, 500*l.*, then 1000*l.* from Bath and Wells; with what justice to these dioceses we shall examine hereafter. With these precedents the Commissioners wisely thought it expedient to have a septennial review of the sums paid (no longer to Queen Anne's Bounty) but to the Commissioners, that they might revise the scale of episcopal payments.

The changes thus made in the episcopal incomes required a change in the scale of first-fruits and tenths: this also was matter of detail, and so to be made over to the standing Commission. Alterations in episcopal patronage, such as these new arrangements shall require, are referred to the same body: so are (to forestall a little) in the fourth Report, the approval of the statutes of chapters, to be revised in consequence of these changes; the disposal of the future surplus of the ROYAL peculiar of Wimborne Minster; power to increase archdeaconries to 200*l.* per annum; compulsory exchanges of advowsons in certain cases, *except when in the hands of laymen*; the subdivision of two stalls in Westminster; power to endow the college of Lampeter with "any part of the remaining property belonging to the canonries, prebends, dignities, and offices of the cathedrals of Wales;" and even to *purchase therewith the patronage* of "any benefices with cure of souls, now connected with that establishment." They were, besides, receivers-general of all the confiscated property of the chapters, which in Report 2 was assigned over to a corporation already existing, Queen Anne's Bounty. This last might seem a trifling alteration; but in reality it transferred the property from a body, consisting simply of bishops and of *all* the bishops, to one consisting of five bishops only (the episcopal commissioners), with eight laymen; so that thenceforth a lay board was to apportion out our bishops' incomes: they were not to allot it among themselves; it was to be done for them without their concurrence or against it. There was not after this, of course, the shadow of any rights of ecclesiastical property; the English was no longer an established Church; it became, as far as the bishops were concerned, a *voluntary* Church in its bad sense,—a Church dependent for its income on the voluntas of the minister of the day. Such was the standing Commission in its outset. *Ex pede disce Herculem!* Only with the gigantic stature which it must, if unchecked, one day attain, may it not resemble those giants of old time, who were enemies to God and His Church, rather than those who did service to mankind!

The Third Report, however, though it enacted little further



in detail, was not without its quota of arbitrary and encroaching enactments. In Report I., as we saw, the mode in which the richer bishoprics shall pay the poorer, was left to themselves; in the Second it was made compulsory, and a power of selling their estates assumed, on the very ground that, on account of the fluctuating incomes of the bishops from year to year, there was an obvious hardship in requiring the bishop to pay a *fixed* annual sum. Report III. retains the power (for power obtained is never relinquished, even if it cease to be wanted for the immediate occasion)—it retains the power of selling the bishops' estates, which was assumed in some measure to prevent this hardship, and at the same time enacts the very scheme itself, with all its hardships. They say\* quietly—

“In that part of our last Report which refers to the contributions to be hereafter furnished by the richer sees towards the augmentation of the poorer, we did not point out the particular mode in which such contribution might be most conveniently made. In some cases a transfer of estates may, probably, be expedient; but in general we think that the most advisable arrangement will be, that each of the bishops of the richer sees should pay to the commissioners the sum which shall be fixed upon, as his quota of contribution to the fund out of which the yearly payments are to be made in augmentation of the poorer bishoprics. Objections may, no doubt, be urged against this plan, on the ground that the fluctuating amount of the episcopal incomes may sometimes make it inconvenient to the holders of the larger sees to pay a certain fixed sum; but upon the whole we think that this mode is less open to objection than any other which has presented itself to us; and it possesses the important advantage of insuring a sufficient fund for the improvement of the smaller sees.”

One would not, of course, for a moment impute any thing like wilful selfishness to the Episcopal Commissioners; yet we cannot but think that they have provided for the poorer bishoprics at the cost of others, and perhaps were the rather deceived, in that they had to pay a certain quota themselves; yet the fluctuation of episcopal incomes might obviously create no difficulty to those who had to pay the respective sums of 2000*l.*, 600*l.*, and 2200*l.* (the Commissioners' contributions), which were yet to leave them in one case the clear annual income of 15,000*l.*, or, in the two other cases, of 10,000*l.*, while yet it might involve very serious difficulty, where bishops have to pay a fixed sum which equals

\* This Report, we understand, has never been published in the parliamentary form, because “the diocesan maps referred to in the second Report, and the completion of which was delayed by the necessity for reconsidering some of the territorial arrangements,” were still uncompleted for the same reason, although the body of the Report speaks of them as finished. These extracts are reprinted from the *British Magazine*, No. 56, p. 193.

their whole income, as where Ely was to pay 5500*l.*, retaining the same. Certainly, if episcopal incomes vary like those of chapters, (and it is known that a larger proportion of their property being let out upon the old tenure of lives, they are much more fluctuating), the incomes of the once wealthy sees of Ely and Winchester may, in single years, be far below the average of those bishoprics which they are called upon to assist.\* Durham, which is to contribute more than as much as it is allowed to retain, yet which, out of some regard to the ancient liberality which that see was wont to exercise, is for a time to be kept above the average, would scarcely exceed it. Worcester, Bath and Wells, would be also decidedly below it. Episcopal expenses are seldom calculated by those fond of dilating on the largeness of episcopal incomes. But supposing such a year to be the first year in which a person shall enter upon his bishopric,† bishops will not be able to fulfil the apostolic injunction, "Owe no man any thing." This is no improbable case; and remarkably enough it has happened, and that at the very first attempt to work this scheme. The plan being new, and the Bishop a better financier than the Commissioners, and resolute in maintaining the rights of his see as well as his own, better terms were given him. People were not prepared at once to see a Bishop of Ely considerably in debt, in order to provide out of the revenues of the see for other bishoprics. But this is only the beginning. Let but this system work on for a few years, and people become accustomed to it, and forget that the diocese of Ely was once

\* Suppose the fine of any given year, (and we have data for this,) to be  $\frac{1}{4}$ ths of the average sum, (and the variation, as above said, will be greater in bishoprics,) the average of Ely is put at 11,000*l.*; 1725*l.* of this is clear uniform income;  $\frac{1}{4}$ ths of the remainder, or the whole, which in any given year might be received, will be about 5360*l.*, in all 7086*l.*; but of this 5500*l.* were to be paid over to the Commissioners, leaving for the episcopal income 1585*l.*; true, if a bishop were to live the cycle of years, and *their returns had been rightly calculated*, he would have the average income; but how are his expenses to be paid during this year? Durham, whose riches are proverbial, has a clear uniform income, we suppose, according to the returns, of 10,320*l.*; but of this 9,800*l.* is to be paid to the Commissioners, leaving to the bishop a fixed income of 520*l.*; if the same ratio were taken, the fluctuating income of this far-famed bishopric might be 5567*l.*, in all 6087*l.*; so again,

				varying	
Winchester, fixed income, £5700—3600 to the fund	=	2100	+	3115 = £5215	
Worcester . . . . .	£3390—2300 . . . . .	=	1090	+	1816 = £2906
Bath and Wells . . . . .	£2755—1000 . . . . .	=	1755	+	1568 = £3323

The sums to be paid are fixed in an order in council, which appeared in the "Gazette," July 18, 1837, inserted in the Brit. Mag. No. 69, p. 317.

† Report I. states, that "the unavoidable expenses attending the appointment of bishops are so considerable, that they may be calculated at the income of one whole year in most of the sees, and at much more than a year's income in the smaller."—p. 9. The Bishop of Ely, in the first year, in which he was to have paid 5500*l.*, received only 2900*l.* or 3000*l.* (*Correspondence*, p. 37.)

richly endowed by pious munificence, and the hardship thus inflicted will be thought no more of than the heavy expenses on entering upon preferment,—a sort of necessary evil.

The larger cycle, moreover, necessary for an average, where much of the income is derived from estates out on lives, entails further evil; for at the age at which persons are ordinarily raised to the episcopal office, it is highly improbable that they should possess the see during the years which complete the cycle. The see then (supposing always that the calculation has been just) will retain the average allotted to it by the act of parliament; the bishops will not, but by haphazard; one, it may be, a great deal more, another as much less. And this is the regulation of a Commission, instituted to provide for the “equalizing” of the incomes of the bishoprics. Supposing the principle admitted, that the richer sees might pay over a proportion of their income to the poorer, still the only tolerably equitable way was, that each see retaining the income fixed should pay over the surplus, whatever it might be. Whatever this sum was to be, was (if equitably obtained) an increase to the poorer bishoprics; and as long as their income was helped out by the unobjectionable annexation of cathedral preferment, the uncertainty could have had no ill effects. They were, *pro tanto*, better off than before. But as soon as the plan of the Commission was changed, and the 30,000*l.* per annum of settled income, which they derived from cathedrals, at once detached, the poorer bishoprics became almost wholly dependent on the richer, upon which they were billeted; and so a fixed income for them was settled upon, at the expense of plain injustice and inequality to the richer sees. The bishoprics which had been endowed and were now plundered, thus changed places with those which had not been endowed, or had been plundered: for the fixed income, even if somewhat smaller, is obviously far better than the larger, which, varying widely, is still charged with an uniform heavy stipend. The Commission had recommended two things wholly incompatible; that the richer sees should retain a certain settled income, 8000*l.*, 7000*l.*, 5500*l.*, or 5000*l.*, and yet out of a varying income pay a certain fixed stipend.

There was also this additional hardship, who was to calculate the income? For instance, the income of Bath and Wells for the three years preceding 31st December, 1831, was returned at 5946*l.*; the future net income calculated at 5500*l.* This was admitted even in Report II., and consequently it was not reduced: then, in Report III., it was reduced to 5000*l.*; and this is fixed by the Act. But the Commissioners have the power of settling the fixed sum; and so to reduce to 5000*l.* an income calculated and admitted at 5500*l.*, his majesty in council was advised to order

it to pay 1000*l.* per annum. Again, after the several reductions in the impost laid upon the see of Ely, the Bishop to the last contended\* (and it seems justly), that even this lowered demand would not leave the income prescribed by the act, yet it was recommended to his majesty in council, and gazetted, and became law.

The Commissioners were evidently forced on to this step reluctantly. We mention it only as an instance of the cruelty and arbitrariness involved in rapid, ill-digested, and theoretic measures, plans upon paper without adequate information.

It is obvious that, in changing the dioceses, the canonical obedience of the clergy was changed too; this might certainly occasion difficulties in scrupulous minds: "Is my allegiance indeed changed, because the bishop to whom I have sworn obedience is worked upon to give me up, and another as unwillingly receives me?" The difficulty, however, was certainly not diminished by a provision in Report III. stating that it would be

"*Necessary* for his majesty in council to declare that those places which may have been transferred from one diocese to another, shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese of which they will then form a part, in all respects and in the same manner as if they had originally belonged to it; and that the jurisdiction of the bishops, from whose dioceses they may respectively have been severed, shall from thenceforth wholly cease."

But this provision completed the Erastian character of the Episcopal Commission. Henceforth, the state is to determine to whom the canonical obedience of the clergy is due. The Episcopate is the creature of the state, to be modelled, re-modelled, or broken in pieces, as it wills.

The FOURTH REPORT, the supplement of the second, recommends little new as to the *English* Chapters, or, rather, retards the date of their reduction to the new dimensions, but it brings forward, for the first time, the *Welsh* Chapters. These are among the oldest institutions of the country; the cathedral of Bangor the very oldest. In the Second Report it was said, page 9—

"The Cathedral and Collegiate Churches of the dioceses in the principality of Wales are, in some respects, so peculiarly circumstanced, as to require that they should be treated in a somewhat different manner from the other Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, although without departing from the main principles laid down in this Report."

The fourth Report is curious then, in this respect, as showing what the Commissioners look upon, as the "main principles of

\* Correspondence, pp. 33, sqq.

the Report;" evidently this, to reduce the cathedrals as low as can be done, and to confiscate the remainder of their property, and not to attend to any thing peculiar in their respective cases. The consideration of these Chapters had been delayed on account of their peculiar circumstances; yet, when considered, they are all subjected to the same rigid law, all brought to the scale of a dean and *two* canons each; to serve, we suppose, as Carlisle did on the present occasion, as a model for future Commissioners, in the further reduction of English chapters. At least, we cannot discover any other ground why, if *four* canons are necessary for England, the Welsh chapters should be reduced to *two*, and the rest of their property confiscated; nor what ground can be alleged why, if these plans succeed, Carlisle may not be brought down to the reduced St. Asaph, as well as Canterbury to Carlisle. We must, then, think that this precedent is *the* recommendation.

In other respects, the fourth Report is principally, though painfully interesting, for the picture it gives of the unsettledness of the Commissioners' plans, and the utter absence of data, amid which they rush on to these tremendous changes. The absence of inquiry is admitted in the very opening sentence. They say—

"Under that head of our second Report which relates to Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, so many points are comprised, affecting a variety of interests, rights, and customs, that it is scarcely possible to lay down any general scheme, which may not be open to some objections, and into which it may not be necessary, upon further inquiry and consideration, to introduce some alterations."

The "multitude of points comprised, affecting a *variety* of interests, rights, and customs," would apparently have been a sound reason for not embracing all in one sweeping change; it is the very argument used by the chapters, why (if any change in the present system was contemplated) all should not be "dealt with" in one and the same way; why inquiry should precede legislation, not legislation inquiry. So also it might, perhaps, have appeared to the Commissioners, had they not committed themselves in the first instance, to the wholesale innovations of the second Report; now it appears only as a witness against themselves, as an answer to detailed objections, and as a reason for putting off the evil to a distant day, by making it over to the "permanent Commission."

Another change would give incidentally a reprieve to the chapters, while it discovers the hastiness of Report II. After the plan for the extinction of the vacant stalls was promulgated, some one must have suggested that, at this rate, not one of the present

generation, not already possessed of these dignities, could look for them, and the ministers of the Crown would lose this species of patronage. Accordingly, a slower scale of reduction was proposed, which should be "more equitable, as regards both the *patrons of cathedral dignities*, and the clergy who may reasonably look to that kind of preferment:"—for ever the patrons, the rights of patrons, the interests of patrons, those who may "reasonably look to" this patronage, as if patrons and patronage, and selfish interests were the only objects of attention in a Christian Church, while the cathedrals themselves are allowed to decay! However, the respite was welcome, come whence it may; only it is strange that a thing so obvious should not have occurred before; as, amid all this sadness, it is an amusing instance of haste, that this Report makes an express provision for the mode in which the chapter of Christ Church in Oxford should be reduced; whereby, out of eight canonries, four are to be suppressed, in order to leave six (Prop. 4.)

All, however, was not retrograde in this Report, even as to the English chapters. On the contrary, there are indications of the gradual creeping on of the destructive system. Report I. recommended the annexation of an important parish to a stall at Westminster, and the subdivision of that stall, but no confiscation; on the contrary, it pointed out the advantage of these stalls being held with bishoprics, thereby enabling them "to part with some, or all, of their impropriations." Report II. recommended the confiscation of eight out of the twelve stalls at Westminster, and the subdivision of one more for a like object with the first; and the similar employment of "*some of the better endowed canonries, which will remain in four or five of the Cathedrals.*" Report IV. takes away the limitation, and recommends "that power be given to unite *such of the better-endowed canonries* in the *respective chapters*, as may be deemed properly available for the purpose, with the parochial charge of populous districts within the dioceses" (Prop. 35.) This might have been foreseen; but any one had been thought a "prophet of ill," who had said that it would have come so rapidly; by this act the chapters are virtually annihilated; power is claimed to seize on the remaining fragments of the Cathedrals, for the *one* end of providing a parochial ministry; the better-endowed stalls are to be subdivided, and charged with payments; so that a canon should be "a person with the care of an over-peopled district, and a reduced income, insufficient to provide assistant curates, and the charge of maintaining

\* Lord J. Russell goes further, "There will be a certain number—but at the same time, a *very small number*—of canonries left, in which the only service to be performed will be the cathedral service, quite unconnected with other duties" [of *annexed* parishes or an archdeaconry.]—July 8, 1836, *Mirr. of Parl.* 2281.

two houses." Henceforth there would be two classes only in the Church, the bishop and the parochial minister.

Consistent with this is another change from Report II. In Report II. it was proposed that

"No appointment should be made to any of the stalls of the old foundation, which are not residentiary, with the exception of some, the income of which is little more than nominal, and which perhaps it may be deemed expedient to retain, as marks of distinction to be bestowed on deserving clergymen."

This exception, we understand, would have saved a large majority of these pieces of preferment, (whose value, in this particular way of expressing the regard of a bishop for a deserving clergyman, is very great,) most, probably, except some of those, for the sake of which this regulation was probably made, those of St. Paul's. All those, *e. g.*, of Exeter would have been preserved.\* But Report IV., without alleging any new ground, to simplify matters, one must suppose, and save inquiry, abolishes all these offices, whose utility Report II. had recognized. It occurs simply among the Propositions (Prop. 29),

"That no new appointments be made to *any* of the prebends, dignities, or offices, not being residentiary, except as herein specified; nor to the Deanery of Wolverhampton."

The finances of the Commission are, we understand, at a low ebb; and this might be inferred from another recommendation of Report IV., "that measures be taken by the said Commissioners for the disposal of the residence houses of the (confiscated) prebends" (Prop. 34). It would otherwise hardly have been proposed that houses within the precincts of a close, or the walls of a college, should have been sold, to become in time, as they passed from hand to hand, taverns or gaming-houses.

One more change in this Report seems necessary to complete the picture; that of the destination of the sum to be obtained from these confiscations. The Second Report had named two classes; 1st, what are commonly called small livings, *i. e.* livings small in income, but often in population also, yet, on the whole, livings with inadequate incomes; 2dly, livings, often well-endowed, but where, through the dense increase of population, the single church stands but as a witness that we acknowledge a God, whom we do not worship; in a word, the overgrown masses of our large towns, where one clergyman has the care of some tens of thousands. Of these, Report II., (as the most compendious method) took account of the former only; it proposed a plan, (with a proviso that it was not to be looked upon as *the* settled

\* Second Exeter Memorial, Chapter Memorials, p. 88. They have a fixed income, 20*l.* per annum.

plan,) whereby "all livings of a population from 300 to 500 should be raised to 150*l.*; from 500 to 2000 to 200*l.*; from 2000 to 5000 to 300*l.*; from 5000 and upwards to 400*l.* per annum; this plan was carried out in detail as to the different dioceses;" it was shown how much should accrue to each class as a whole and in each diocese. It was, indeed, implied that the whole sum to be obtained from the cathedrals would not suffice for this; since all they hoped to obtain ultimately from the abolition of the 432 offices, and the abstraction of the estates of the remainder, was 125,357*l.* per annum,\* and this plan alone would require 276,641*l.*; and so it was suggested, that—

"Benefices in public patronage, were, in the first instance, the preferable objects of assistance from the funds, which we propose to make available to the purposes of augmentation."

These would require, on this plan, only 145,195*l.* per annum; still, somewhat more than what they thought might be abstracted from the cathedrals and the sinecure rectories. Thus, then, expectations were raised; though the plan was stated not to be fixed upon, nay, that the Commissioners had not fixed upon even "the general principles of distribution," still all this detail showed that it was *a* plan entertained; it was ready calculated how much each class of livings in each diocese was to have, and each clergyman in either of these classes was taught to calculate how much he might obtain of his neighbour's goods. The Fourth Report sweeps all this away; it rightly gives a preference to the wants and circumstances of the places in which the revenues accrue;—an alteration intended to meet some objections made by the chapters, of the injustice of the measure to the places whose impropriations they held, but which (as we shall show) the chapters themselves could have executed much better,—and then proposes that the rest should be applied to "making *additional provision* for cure of souls, in parishes where such assistance is most required;" accordingly to the second class only. The former plan was indeed altogether a wasteful one; it frittered away, for the most part, the sums so dearly obtained, verifying the old saying, "ill-got, ill-spent;" but a change so total, in a plan put out a few months before, betrays the precipitancy with which the plans of the Commissioners had been conducted.

Such was the close of the *genuine* acts of the *second* commission. Shortly after the appearance of this Fourth Report, which

\* The estimate of Report II. has been taken. A few months later, Lord J. Russell, a Commissioner, calculated it at 120,494*l.* (July 8, 1836, *Mirror of Parl.* 2281). There is much reason to believe even this exaggerated. "That any such sum will be available for purposes of augmentation, the experience of Boards and Commissions forbids us to expect."—*Archdeacon Thorp's Charge*, p. 16. The sinecure rectories, valued at 8894*l.* per annum, are here omitted.



had not yet reached many of the chapters, the delegates of chapters, assembled in London to remonstrate collectively against the second, which had reached them recently, were informed in answer to their suggestions, that the Commissioners regarded themselves as "*functi officio*;"\* they could not entertain their complaints; they had no power; their work was done.

Before proceeding further, then, it is well to sum up what *this* Commission had done; what it had left unfinished. With regard to bishoprics, it had had two points in view, to equalize their size and, within certain limits, their incomes: for the size, they had proposed a large scheme, whose details they have not yet filled up, whereby they prospectively abolished three bishoprics, erected two, and changed the boundaries of all but three.† They did this in a general way; but so little has it been liked by the whole of their brethren, that they have been obliged, in almost every instance, to wait for the death of the existing bishops, in order to effect their scheme. *They have forced a re-modelled episcopacy, against the concurrence of their brethren, upon the whole Church.* Had the present bishops approved of the scheme, it might, thus far, have been effected at once; but the whole is made over to a permanent Commission, to dismember the dioceses, as they became deprived of their bishops, because the present bishops do not come into the scheme, but it has been forced upon them by the civil power. In consequence, it has not been done once for all; the powers granted to the new Commission are sufficient to enable them, provided they retain the *number* of the English dioceses, to remodel the dioceses further, as they will. Thus it has unsettled the territorial jurisdiction of the bishops, and has not resettled it.

With regard to the revenues of the bishoprics, their independence is gone. The new Commission has received and claimed the power of selling estates of individual bishops, as it pleases; of exacting an annual payment, which shall not leave to the bishop thus compelled to pay, the annual sum which they covenanted that he should retain. The property of the bishops, as well as the extent of their dioceses, is in the hands of the Commissioners, no longer in themselves. The precedent has been set, that parliament shall decide the extent of the bishop's incomes; what this will mean hereafter, any one may know; the radical party has already habituated itself to speak of "paying bishops," "granting to bishops,"‡ to except against the "largeness of the

\* At least, so it was stated to the delegates by a noble earl, uncontradicted, in the presence of his colleagues. This is mentioned also by Dr. Spry, p. 8.

† Bath and Wells, Chichester, Exeter.

‡ "The public, I repeat, will not be satisfied with such an arrangement as that which gives 15,000*l.* a-year to one bishop, 8000*l.* to another, 7000*l.* to another, 5000*l.* to another, and so on. Why this is the way to keep the whole bench in a constant

sums which they vote to bishops ;” because the property which the state never gave, has been submitted to the revision of the state, without any previous consultation of the Church.

The bribe held out by Lord J. Russell to the refractory adherents of his party, was this :\*—

“ It does involve a very great measure of reform in the Church ; and it does, *above all, assert an important principle*, so strongly deprecated by the honourable baronet, the member for Oxford, namely, *that parliament has a right to deal with its revenues, and to superintend their distribution.*”

True, that some who wished for more, were not satisfied, because this was not *expressed* in the bill, and said that they had not gained even thus much ; yet when the time shall come, every one knows that these expressions will be forgotten, and the pre-

state of pecuniary independence [*sic*], which cannot but be injurious to the character of the hierarchy and clergy generally, in the estimation of the country !”—Mr. Hume’s Speech, July 14, 1836, *Mirror of Parl.* p. 2380. “ For a bishop, I think, 4500*l.* a-year ought to be sufficient ; the extra 500*l.* a-year would form a surplus, from which spiritual aid might be provided for 136,000 of his majesty’s subjects.”—Mr. R. Wason, *ib.* 2284. “ Before we consent to assign the sum of 15,000*l.* to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 10,000*l.* to the Bishop of London, and 8000*l.* to another prelate, we ought to assure ourselves, that we have money enough left to make the provision necessary for the inferior clergy.”—Mr. F. Buxton, *ib.* 2287. “ The sum of 4594*l.* is to be given to a dean in one place.”—*Id. ib.* 2288. “ It is beginning at the wrong end to make a provision for the bishops before any other consideration.”—*Ib.* In like way Mr. Poulter, p. 2289. Mr. C. Buller speaks of “ erecting two new bishoprics,” and apparently thinks it monstrous, “ in the 36th year of the 19th century of the Christian era.” “ You are going to make two bishops with this surplus property. It may be necessary and important to make two bishops ; but I say it is a million times more necessary and more important to give powerful assistance without loss of time, to the spiritual wants of the working classes of the diocese.”—Mr. Lambton, *ib.* 2349. “ With all this staring them in the face, they give to the dean of Durham ten times more than the dean of Chester, and they also leave three or four large livings above 3 or 4000*l.* a-year untouched.”—*Ib.* [There is in the diocese of Durham only one living above 4000*l.* a-year, and two others only above 2000*l.*, Bishops’ Wearmouth, 2899*l.*, and Houghton, 2157*l.* ; but this only illustrates how vaguely people speak, and does not affect the principle.] “ Some mode must be adopted of relieving the Dissenters from the payment of churchrates, before I, for one, can consent to vote for a bill, which confers a salary of 15,000*l.* a-year upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, and salaries amounting in some instances to 7000*l.* upon the bishops. Nothing can tend so much to aggravate the feelings of the Dissenters, as to see an overpaid hierarchy out of the rates [!] to which they unwillingly contribute.”—Mr. Lennard, *ib.* 2378. “ I only wish them [the government] to follow up this principle [the appropriation of cathedral property] and to see whether it be consistent to grant large incomes to the bishops and archbishops, without regard to the possible creation of a surplus for the creation of new preferments.”—Mr. Poulter, *ib.* 2378. “ The bill will leave 150,000*l.* of the public money (for such I will call it) to be appropriated to the bishops.”—Mr. Hume, *ib.* 2462. “ The legislature refused to give 50,000*l.* for the general education of the poor in Ireland without any religious distinction, but they will not refuse to give 150,000*l.* a-year to twenty-eight [twenty-six] bishops in England.”—Mr. Baines, *ib.* 2543.

As if there were something infectious in the tone of that assembly, even Sir R. Peel speaks “ of the emoluments to be attached to the office of bishops” (*ib.* 2380), while Lord Melbourne, it is right to state, in the House of Lords, placed the question on its right footing (*ib.* 2608).

\* *Mirr. of Parl.* 1836, p. 2465.

cedent urged. The changes contemplated, even when they included some as yet averted, were avowedly accepted, and in one case, by one of no low station,\* as an instalment.

The precedent also set in this case, with regard to the bishops' estates, applies apparently to the utmost extent *à fortiori* to the inferior clergy. Let these look to themselves in time. The paramount authority of the state, as involved by this act of the Commission, has already been asserted in high quarters, by a Commissioner and a Bishop† highly respected.

"It has been said that the Commissioners, by their recommendations, have sanctioned the principle, that the state can at will re-distribute the revenues of the clergy. I answer that this principle was assumed in the very terms of the Commission. They could not stir one step towards the fulfilment of the purposes for which they were appointed, without recommending a change in the distribution of some portion or other of the ecclesiastical property."

Had this been so, the blame would be removed not to "those who advised the formation of the Commission" (for these were laymen), but from the specific recommendations of the bishops, to their consenting to act upon the commission at all. They alone are responsible for the Commission, for without them it could not have had effect. The Commission, however, left the bishops free to settle their incomes among themselves;‡ it did not require five to proceed independently of the rest. These five made that a measure of state, which, had they acted in concert with their brethren, would have been a measure of the Church; they, for the first time, in the English branch of the Church Catholic, sanctioned the principle that "the state can, AT WILL, re-distribute the revenues of the clergy."

The state was not referred to, as in former times, to give the force of law to the decisions of the Church; it was referred to as *the* tribunal, and it will treasure up the precedent. Unless a firmer tone be somewhere taken, what now seem to some the ludicrous claims of revolutionists, will soon become the received maxims of politicians. We have seen already how maxims creep gradually upwards, from the extreme to the middle, and from the middle spread through the whole political frame.

\* Lord Howick, *ib.* 2543; Dr. Lushington, 2544; Mr. Grote, *ib.* 2542; and Mr. Villiers, *ib.* 2545.

† Bishop of Lincoln's Charge.

‡ "To effect this object (equalizing, in some degree, the episcopal incomes), if all the bishops had been, as I think they ought to have been, called into consultation for the common good, some plan of *internal* arrangement might surely have been devised, by which the necessities of the poorer might have been supplied out of the abundance of the richer sees, without resorting to parliamentary interference of so extended a nature."—Mr. Benson's *Letter to Bishop of Lincoln*, p. 11.

A portion of the House of Commons has already shown its inclination to carry out these principles; and the Commissioners have abandoned, or rather undermined, the strong ground of property, and taken up with the weak and indefensible post of patronage; they can no longer consistently maintain that a parish is to remain endowed, because former piety endowed it, but simply, because the nomination has been entrusted to a given individual, and he has been hitherto permitted to make that nomination marketable. Even this would only apply to that proportion of livings which is in private patronage, (for the independence of episcopal and chapter and corporate property, and crown patronage, they have given up,) and for these, what stand could be made on such a questionable and often-abused power, as that of selling the nomination to cure of souls? This was a valuable and important *trust*, but ought never to have been made marketable *property*; and great evils, and much impediment to good, have resulted from it. What stand then, we ask again, can be made upon this, after the sacredness of endowments in behalf of particular places or ends, to which donors consecrated their property, has been abandoned? What can be said to such as urge\*

“Why are not some of the larger livings—livings enormously disproportionate to the services required—to be reduced to the limits of a fair and moderate income? for it is not one of the least singular of the omissions in these Reports—that not a syllable is said of Stanhope, or Bishop’s Wearmouth, or of the numerous other preferments, which, instead of being a support, are the bane and ruin of the Church.”

We should answer at once, because the endowments have been given to these places and not to others; we should hold that such endowments are responsible, to the fullest extent, for providing for the spiritual wants of their whole districts, and that this might be enforced far more than at present, but that it were wrong and robbery to abstract any of the endowments for other places. But what answer could be given on the principles of this commission? We are sure, none! The abstraction of the property of the cathedrals is a precedent for the spoliation of every endowment in the kingdom. If the ground of patronage be allowed to weigh, it will only be because the patrons are the legislators; it will abide a struggle, no more than the rights of the patrons of parliamentary boroughs; which also were marketable property.

\* Mr. F. Buxton (*Mirr. of Parl.* 1836, p. 2287, 8). Bishop’s Wearmouth is a singular instance to give, because, though its annual value is 2,899*l.*, its population was in 1831, 16,590; 516*l.* per annum is already paid to curates; such a parish should have sixteen clergymen at least; and then how large would be even on their estimate the disposable surplus? Would an endowment, which provided a pastor for each 1000 of the flock, be indeed a bane to the Church? The redistribution of *livings* was spoken on also by Mr. Lambton, *ib.* 2340, Mr. Robinson, 2379, Mr. Lennard, 2462, Mr. Hume, 2540.

There can be no tenable medium between the assertion of the sacredness of endowments for the purposes to which they were given, and of the inherent right of those bodies or individuals to whom they have been entrusted, (except in unforeseen cases which are plainly understood to be exceptions,) and that of the absolute controul of the present generation over the whole.

“ I could understand,” says Mr. Buxton\*, “ how a defence of this state of things might be set up upon the ground taken by the honourable member for Oxford University, (Sir R. Inglis, who had maintained the principles here advocated,) but I *cannot* understand, I confess, how those who do believe that the legislature has a right to deal with Church property, for the purpose of making it effectually conduce to the religious instruction of the people, can consent to leave the matter, as it will be left by this bill, with all those great evils totally neglected.”

And yet throughout the debates on this subject, except Sir R. Inglis and Mr. A. Trevor, even those who were disposed for the time to think some ecclesiastical property sacred, could devise no other ground than that of private patronage. The principles of these recommendations, carried as they have been, are sufficient to unsettle the whole arrangement of endowments in the kingdom, and to throw the whole into the power of parliament.

We may sum up this argument with Mr. Benson’s† strong but unhappily too just expostulation with a Commissioner.

“ I feel, my lord, that this detail of the provisions of the act is tedious, but I fear that it is fatally instructive. For what possible interference with ecclesiastical persons and property can the parliament hereafter propose, for which they may not find a precedent in the conduct of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners themselves? Is it thought fit to reduce two dioceses into one? The Commissioners have sanctioned not only the power but the right of the legislature to effect it, and they have said nothing *which should make it necessary at the same time to create a new one*. Is it deemed expedient to revise, alter, and reduce the scale of payment to the said bishops? Parliament may do it for its own purposes, for the Commissioners have required them to do it for theirs. Do they wish to remove a bishop from his habitation or transfer some of his real estates? What should hinder them from performing at their own will, what for the will of the Commissioners they have already agreed to? And what should hinder them from continually requiring all sorts of returns of property, its value, its title-deeds, its securities? The Church Commissioners have taught the principle, by giving to parliament the occasion of intermeddling with ecclesiastical property in the most extensive degree, and searching into it in the most inquisitorial manner. They have by their example instructed the legislature to change, buy, sell, tax, and borrow money upon, the possessions

\* Mirr. of Parl. 2463.

† Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, pp. 7, 8.

of the Church, and to set up a board, and a secretary, and clerks and officers for the purpose, and pay them, as it would seem probable, out of the very possessions which are to be so deranged. That is, the Commissioners have led the way for the love of patronage to exercise itself, and shown how the newly-created situations may be paid without appealing to a public, which is wisely not willing of itself to pay for such things.

"They have, in fact, destroyed one of the best securities for the permanency of ecclesiastical property, the undisturbed antiquity of its title, and the long prescription it has enjoyed. They have placed it, at least the episcopal possessions, upon a purely parliamentary foundation. Henceforth every bishop must plead his right to what he retains or receives as the revenues of his office, not upon what his predecessors for time immemorial had by ancient custom held as their sacred portions, but upon a statute of yesterday. The statute of William IV. cap. 77, is now the basis of their possessions, a basis which the hands that placed in the past year, may in the very next disturb or remove."

It is worth while to hear, on these changes, the concurring sentiments of two very opposite persons, the one in fruitless warning, before the bill confirming these changes was passed, the other in insulting triumph after it had passed.

The first were the simple words of the late straight-forward and amiable Bishop of Hereford,\* verifying the remark how far-sighted single-hearted simple-mindedness often is.

"I believe that the effect of the bill will be, to render the clergy mere stipendiaries of the state. Although such a proposition is not positively advanced in the bill, I believe it must follow as a necessary consequence: for the man who is not at liberty to hold and administer his property himself, but is amenable to a tribunal, which has the power to examine into the amount of his property, and say to him, "Beyond this you must not go; deliver the rest to me:" such a man I cannot conceive to be in any other state than that of a dependent person. I would ask, is that the intention of the Church Commissioners? But I will refrain from going further: seeing the opinion is held by a large majority, or rather nearly the entire of your lordships' House.—I shall only observe, that I feel this bill to be a blow struck at the Church, from the effect of which, if carried, I fear it will never recover."

The taunt came, not from a radical, but from a minister of the crown, whose spoliation in the matter of church-rates was being resisted. He contended, (and truly enough, in as far as it was not a question of sacrilege,) that he was but acting on the precedent set him.†

"They who oppose the present proposition stand upon the principle Mr. Burke declared for, 'that Church property ought to be as secure in its enjoyment by those who hold it, as any private property is in private

\* Debate on second reading, *Mirr. of Parl.* p. 2610.

† Debate on Church Rates, May 23.

hands.' In the general proposition I fully agree. But this is not the case *at present*: this is not the character they *now* have. This character with its *disadvantages*, has of late been essentially changed by acts of parliament, *passed last year*, and by various orders in council following each other, I had almost said, day after day, and one of which, I believe, has issued this very day. It is only this very day, I think, by an order in council, you make this proposition to a bishop, 'If your income is more than parliament has declared it ought to be, you shall pay a certain sum to the Chancellor of the Exchequer; if your revenue be less, we, or rather the Commissioners, are to pay you a certain sum, equivalent to the difference between the amount so fixed and the annual receipt.' So that the fixed sum or income, whether it be 4000*l.*, 5000*l.*, 6000*l.*, or 8000*l.*, will be what *parliament* or the Church Commissioners shall have determined on as the *proper* sum to be paid. This arrangement having once been made, the whole argument as to the *independent* character of the bishops, of which we have heard so much, and as to their *being proprietors of the land*, is at an end."

But neither is this arrangement final; the Commissioners in that they exceeded the bounds of their Commission, and recommended that no canonry or deanery should be held with a bishopric, rendered any final arrangement impossible. They reduced the sum total of virtual episcopal income far below what it had been wont to be; and what it was, they had over-estimated. The smaller bishoprics had mostly been supported by the cathedral preferment held by the bishops; this they struck off, imagining that by a re-distribution, they might attain an adequate income. But in the very first case, in which they attempted to apply their scale of reduction, they failed. After reducing their claim from 5500*l.* per annum (Report II.) to 5000*l.* (Report III.), they were brought down to 4000*l.* and an estate, (then worth 4000*l.*, and ultimately 6000*l.*); then to 2500*l.*, leaving the estate to the see; and finally waiving the first year's payment; and this last sum did not leave for the expenses of the bishop, for the first year of his episcopacy, more than 3000*l.*\* The result is, that in commercial language, the Commission is already bankrupt; it was obliged to deduct a per-centage from the allowances to which it

\* See "Correspondence between the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Bishop of Ely." The peremptory tone, however, taken throughout, and especially at the close, on the part of the Commissioners, makes what the Bishop of Exeter mentioned as "possible," seem to us any thing but improbable, if but time be allowed, and the Commission passes gradually into other hands, "that the Commissioners might recommend some scheme, which would *destroy the independent character of the clergy, and make them stipendiaries of the state*; and that measures might be proposed, which would enable the Commissioners *absolutely to grasp the whole of the Church lands and estates*. I consider that to be possible, but I do not think it is gravely intended by the present Commissioners that such schemes should be proposed."—*Mirr. of Parl.* 2610.

was pledged; and in one case, in which the increased travelling expenses were allowed to a bishop, who had yielded to their urgency, and allowed the size of his see to be doubled (we are speaking, of course, only of notorious facts), this per-centage was deducted not only on the allowance made, but on the whole income of the see. Credit thus failing, must needs be propped up in some fresh way: in other words, neither in this respect are the recommendations of the Commission final. Other innovations must be resorted to, if the present is to be carried through.

The precedent of a gradual enlargement of the bounds within which the Commission is to act, has been already set in the cases of York and Bath and Wells, and is the more formidable from its very gradualness. It is true, that a certain portion of ground only has been secured by the act of parliament; only the sees named therein are for the present liable to have their incomes re-adjusted by the Permanent Commission; but since our bishops now hold their property only by permission of parliament, what is to hinder, as revenues diminish, the same process being applied to Lichfield and Coventry, now estimated at 4350*l.*, Lincoln 4200*l.*, Norwich 4700*l.*, Salisbury 5000*l.*, so as to bring them down to the proposed minimum of 4000*l.*? It were a tolerable evil, though a very mournful one, to see an act of violence perpetrated once for all; if our house is robbed once for all, we know the extent of the loss; but to live in a constant state of insecurity, or rather to know that our foundations of all sorts are in a constant state of insecurity, that not only an act has been committed, but a principle sanctioned, whose application has been gradually extended, and which may creep on, like the leprosy on the walls, around all our hallowed foundations, this opens a prospect indeed miserable!

The measures as to the chapters may be summed up more briefly; by way of destruction well nigh every thing was done; by way of setting up, nothing; the whole disposition of the calculated 130,000*l.* per annum, was left to the Standing Commission, i. e. to the minister of the day, to parcel out as he thinks fit; no one limitation made, except that

“The property and revenues rendered available by these alterations, should, after due [?] consideration of the wants and circumstances of the places in which they accrue, be applied to the purpose of making additional provision for the cure of souls in parishes where such assistance is most required, in such manner as shall be most conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church.”

What security this would be, when it is held that a (professed) member of the Established Church cannot mean any harm to it;



that consequently Romanists, though they have sworn to do nothing to subvert the Established Church, may join in measures which they see to be destructive to it, if but a professed member of the Church proposes them; when, for the civil power to abolish ten bishoprics at a stroke, is for the interests of the Established Church; to abolish church-rates is for the interests of the Church; to admit persons of any or no religion to our fellowships in the Universities, is for the interests of the Church; what security this clause will be, it needs no diviner to tell. It would be difficult to say what evil might, in certain quarters, *not* be thought for the interests of the Church; but we know that an involuntary poverty, and the loss of her endowments, is held, as a fundamental principle, to be for her interests.

It is difficult also to say, amid the present lax notions about the Church, who (except perhaps the Romanists) might not or would not regard themselves members of the Church for an end. A member of the House of Commons said plainly,

“I, though a member of another religious community, consider myself of the Church of England. Now, if I were appointed, I should like to know whether my appointment would be valid.”†

Neither need we say how injurious it would be to the independence of the Clergy that 130,000*l.* of their annual income should be at the disposal of the minister of the day. It were a worse than voluntary system, it were to make them stipendiaries of a politician. It is bad enough to hear Church patronage spoken of as “oil to grease the wheels of government;” but under that system, the bribe is offered, happily, not to the clergyman, but to his patron; and that system cannot last long; the plan of the Commissioners would make the clergy dependents upon parliament. In proportion as the independence of the clergy has been a blessing to the state as well as to the Church, would this change be miserable.

Equal power is left to the Commission as to the remaining stalls; all the canonries which they think fit for the purpose, are to be placed at their disposal, to divide, subdivide, and annex to populous places. In a word, then, full power is given them to do what they will with the revenues of the dissolved prebends, and with the prebends which remain; but *nothing is done* except to dissolve the one, and give power over the other. The power given is the more fearful, because so unbounded.

In the feeling words of the late lamented Bishop of Hereford,†

“My feelings are entirely consonant with those of the illustrious duke

\* Mr. Benson makes the same remark.—*Letter*, p. 9, 10.

† *Mirr. of Parl.* 1836, p. 2293.

‡ On the motion that the bill do pass.—*Mirr. of Parl.* p. 2741.

(Cumberland)—as respects the bill, now that it has received all the alterations proposed, I still view it with the same misgivings, and the same fears, that it may work ill to the Church.—Those (clergy) with whom I have had the means of communicating personally or by letter, or whose opinions I have ascertained from others, entertain but one common sentiment, and that is a feeling of distrust and dismay. They see that arrangements are made, *under which the property of the Church is to be disturbed, but how it is to be re-settled, they have yet to learn.* There is no legislation in this bill for its future settlement; there is to be a committee for the regulation of the property of the Church, and they are to be bound down to certain points, it is true, but these points are various; and the powers given to the Commissioners are, I conceive, very great and most extraordinary. However, it is not for me to detain the House—but I must relieve my conscience by saying, that I regard the measure with great fear and alarm, and that I have no participation in it.”

The character of the Commission is still further illustrated, by following it from its recommendatory to its legislative period; and that chiefly in two points: 1. The rigour with which all its recommendations were enforced, and no amendment permitted. 2. The manner in which the powers given to the new incorporated Parliamentary Commission were obtained and modified.

1. One should certainly gladly dispense with any interference in the House of Commons on any details of a Church bill, and the side which different parties took in this case, gave an apt illustration how fit they were, impartially to legislate for the Church. Some high-minded Churchmen voted against the bill upon principle; and with these were ranged the Radicals and Dissenters, because they wished to put in a claim for some of the spoils (an early indication of the wisdom of these changes of property): it was supported by the ministers who brought it in, by the Conservatives, because they wished to claim the credit of being Church-Reformers, and by the Papists, because they feared that their patrons would be forced to resign. And thus, though time was demanded by Churchmen on behalf of the Church, as well as by the representatives of the Dissenters, it was hurried through the House of Commons in seventeen days. In the House of Lords, in which, on account of the presence of the bishops, the clergy are in these days thought to be represented, more deliberation might have been expected. But it passed the bill on the tenth day after it was brought in, the eleventh after it left the Commons; four weeks were thought sufficient to pass a bill full of important principles, affecting both the property and the constitution of the Church. It is plain, then, that those who carried it through, did not look upon themselves as legislators, but only as confirming the acts of the Commission. All examination into details was rejected, as a prin-

ciple, in the lower House, by Sir Robert Peel,\* as well as by Lord John Russell; in the upper House by the Duke of Wellington.† They were taunted by the ultra section,‡ that the “object of the bill appeared to be to throw the burden of legislation off their own shoulders.” This had been right, had the bill emanated from the Church; coming, as it did, from a few bishops, joined on to a decided majority of laymen, it was most unconstitutional; it made the Commission the legislative for the Church. Nay, since it was stated on high authority, that in its later stage the Commission disagreed within itself, a section of the Commission, seven against six,§ was its legislative. Two powerful parties had, however, taken it up; the Conservatives had commenced; the Whigs had built up; neither would lose the credit which they supposed to attach to it, and so even when the flagrant injustice committed on the Isle of Mann was excepted against, but seven persons, five bishops, (the rest of those not on the Commission having, at this late period of the session, returned to their dioceses,) and two laymen, were found to oppose it. The rights of the Isle of Mann were resisted on no other ground than that the Commission was to be taken as a whole. It was thus admitted, that the legislative of the Church was given to a small fraction of the episcopal order, and to the ministers of the Crown. This is the first step towards bringing the Church into a truly Protestant dependence on the state.

2. Still more important, in this point of view, is the constitution given to the Commission, and the way in which it was given. It was, as stated above, for the first time hinted at, and very indistinctly, in the second Report, presented on March 10, 1836. It was first distinctly announced in the third, bearing date May 20, but not its constitution; a similar Commission had been imposed upon Ireland shortly before, “of which *one member only* was removable at the pleasure of the crown;” the third Report recommended the Commission, but not how it should be constituted; its framers, of course, knew that they should be themselves appointed. Further, even in the third Report it was only incidentally conveyed that this Commission was to be perpetual, and that for *one* single purpose, the revision of the episcopal revenues.

\* *Mirr. of Parl.* p. 2380.

† On the question of the preservation of the Bishopric of Mann, *Ib.* p. 2634.

‡ As by Mr. C. Buller, *Ib.* p. 2290.

§ “It was quite true, that the Commissioners on some points in their Report, appear to have differed, and to have been so nearly divided, as that the numbers were as six to seven; yet he was entitled to state, that when they were appointed, on the issuing of the Commission, they did not differ in politics; but circumstances had since changed, and with that change of circumstances a division took place between them.” *Sir R. Peel's Speech* (as reported by the Standard, July 9, 1836; this part is omitted in the *Mirror of Parliament*, p. 2286).

The Church then had no notice whatever of this frightful power, until within about two months before it was made law, and that through the chance information of newspapers;\* there was no time left for thought or consultation; the bishops, "who† both for themselves and the Church were so deeply interested in the bill, *were not allowed even to see it, much less to state any objections to it, before it was introduced into Parliament,*" i. e. four weeks before it was made law. But this was not all; the worst provision was introduced on the ipse dixit of Lord J. Russell after the third reading of the bill. Objections had been made to the power given to the Commissioners on two sides; by the Churchmen for the sake of the Church, by the Dissenters lest the Church, as they esteemed it, i. e. lest the ecclesiastical portion of the Commission should be too independent of parliament. "It would," said one, "be worse," [i. e. more independent of parliament,] "than a revival of the House of Convocation." These were to be attended to; and so just at the third reading, Lord J. Russell stated that he intended to propose that "the two archbishops and the Bishop of London and others [the ministers of the crown] should be official Commissioners, but that the bishops last-named in the commission, and the three last-named Lay-commissioners should be removable at the pleasure of the crown." Thus the Commission was placed entirely in the hands of the prime-minister of the day; for while by one clause the presence of *two* bishops was made essential to any recommendation, and thus, we must say cunningly, an appearance was given of "doing nothing without the bishop," another clause provided that *two* bishops of the Commission should be dependent upon the crown; and not this only, but "in case any two episcopal Commissioners, being the only episcopal Commissioners present, should object to the ratification of any such proceeding, such ratification or affixing of the seal shall [only] not take place until a subsequent meeting of the Commissioners shall have been held, after due notice thereof." But in this second meeting, not even the five bishops are entitled to outweigh the minister and his adherents. It is then essentially a political Commission. Nor is even this all. For the bill further provides, that—

"A copy of every order of his majesty in council made under this act, shall be *laid before each House of Parliament*, in the month of January, or within one week after the next meeting thereof."

This altogether harmonizes with a political commission; but whoever has observed how the popular portion of parliament absorbs into itself the controul of every thing laid before it, and

\* The British Magazine was not enabled to print the Third and Fourth Reports till August, on the 5th of which this measure passed the House of Lords.

† Bishop of Exeter's Charge, p. 25.

that this was the especial wish of the ultra-section in that House,\* may well shrink back from the whirlpool into which our vessel has been drifted.

“Hoc Ithacus velit et magni mercentur Atridæ.”

“The bill being first introduced into the house of Commons, and having there received one of its worst changes—that which made the Commissioners removable at the pleasure of the crown, *avowedly for the purpose of making them more dependent on that House*—when it reached the Lords, but little hope was presented, and so we were expressly told, of effecting any amendment, without insuring the ultimate rejection of the bill itself. For the minister who had introduced it into the House of Commons, is represented to have declined to press the measure in any form which should render it unacceptable to a certain portion of his adherents.”†

We have hitherto been accustomed to look with compassion upon our Irish sister, and not a few remonstrances were made to ministers by the anti-church party, that the two branches of the Church were not placed upon the same footing, and the same measures of “appropriation” dealt to England as to Ireland. In this respect, however, we are “laid in iron” sooner and faster than our sister; perhaps because she was weak, we strong; she therefore was plundered and had but light chains put upon her; we are fettered now, that we may be plundered hereafter. However, so it is, the political character of our “permanent Commission” is a strange contrast even to her’s. This was put to the House by the Bishop of Exeter with his usual force and clearness.‡

“My objection does not rest here,” [that the Commission was made a corporation,] “I object to the composition of the Commission. I put it to you, whether you can find a single instance of the vast majority of a Commission being removable at the pleasure of the crown. But the objection which I feel to the construction of the Commission, does not stop here. The Commissioners being subject to removal at the pleasure of the crown will necessarily become a political body, liable to shift and change with the change of government and the variations of political influence; they will, therefore, be exposed to the temptation of using their power for political purposes. It is only two or three years ago since a similar Commission was created for ecclesiastical offices in Ireland; and I entreat your Lordships’ attention to the composition of that Commission: it consisted of the Lord Primate, the Archbishop of Dublin, four Bishops, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, and three others, not necessarily lay or clerical; two of whom were nominated by the king’s solicitor or council, and one by the primate. Of all these persons

\* See Speeches of Mr. Baines (*ib.* 2542); Mr. Hume, Mr. C. Buller, Mr. Ewart, &c.—p. 2541.

† Bishop of Exeter’s Charge, p. 25.

‡ On the second reading, *Mirror of Parl.* p. 2609.

only two are removable at the will of the government, the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief Justice. In selecting the highest judicial functionaries, your lordships will perceive that the motive for so doing was to appoint those least likely to be actuated by political motives. There are four bishops and three others, all of whom hold their places not at the will of the crown, but for life. The Irish Commission was thus rendered independent, which, I think, every Commission of the sort ought to be. This departure, on the part of the present government, from the precedent they so recently established, I confess, does not a little startle me, especially as that precedent seems to be avoided in such a way as to make the ecclesiastical Commissioners totally dependent upon the political influence of the day. I am willing to hope, however, that when the bill goes into the committee, it will receive some improvement in this respect."

But it was in vain, however, that "all the English bishops,\* not being members of the Commission, who were able to protract their attendance in parliament to so late a period," opposed it; *sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas*. The "minister of the people" in the lower House would only pass the bill if the Commissioners were made dependent; and so through panic, lest the House of Commons should think themselves entitled to dispose of revenues once brought before them, the bill was past, lest it should have again to be submitted to that assembly.†

Thus then the Incorporated Commission was established; its powers were limited as to the subjects only; on these subjects they were unlimited. The Commission had but to make a recommendation to his majesty in council, i. e. *as is always the case*, to his majesty in the presence of the *same Commissioners*; and then the Commissioners having formally advised his majesty to do as they had themselves before-hand recommended to his majesty, the recommendation is gazetted, and becomes law! It was, however, contended that the Commissioners should be limited as to the subjects on which they were to recommend; doubtless they were at first, though even then, as we have seen, within no narrow range; even then the horizon which bounded them was far enough; but who ever reached the horizon? or when was a large machinery ever set up, which was ultimately restrained to the execution of that for which it was primarily designed? It was truly said by one of the most far-sighted minds of this day,‡

"There is in the bill, as it now stands, an inclination to a perpetual change, *because a machinery calculated to produce a perpetual change is to be established.*"

This was said not two years past, yet it was said before any

\* Bishop of Exeter's Charge.

† *Mirror of Parl.* p. 2541.

‡ Bishop of Exeter, *Mirror of Parl.* l. c. 2609.

symptoms had appeared of intending to commit to the Commission any further offices; it was said while politicians were protesting that the Commission was perfectly safe *because* its objects were limited; and the next year was happily a quiet year for the Church, because it was assailed as a whole; there were no more questions of innovations within it, because there were attacks from without; the fruitless attempt to abolish church-rates, diverted the energy which was employed on re-modelling her; the pressure from without kept peace within.

The "permanent Commission" also was issued, in order to carry into effect the details of such recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, as could not under the circumstances then be completed; it was a prolonged session of the former Commission to complete such matters, as they did not possess sufficient information, or had not taken time, or which regard to vested rights allowed them not, to complete. There was no reason in the nature of things, why they should not at some period finish their labours, though there was reason enough in human nature to think that a machinery so convenient, and giving such power to the state over the Church, would not be readily broken up. Yet now, at the very commencement of the second session, besides all the fresh powers proposed to be bestowed upon the Corporate Commission, if the bill against the Cathedrals should be carried, large powers are conveyed to it in a bill less likely to be objected to, the Plurality Bill. This extension of power illustrates two points; 1. The inclination to turn over to the Commission every thing connected with the Church; 2. To make it a court of ultimate appeal above the Bishops, and even the Metropolitan himself. It is remarkable, further, that this bill *directly* interferes with the Liturgy, and prescribes the mode of our devotions: a *lay* bill, prepared and brought in by two of the "ministers of the people," prescribes that "in every chapel of the annual value [!] of 150*l.* where the population shall amount to 400, there shall be two sermons, unless the Bishop shall dispense with one;" i. e. a lay bill, brought into a house, where persons of all or no forms of religion are mixed up together, prescribes the duties of the ministers of the Church, does not simply give the Bishop power *legally* to enforce certain points, but changes them itself, peremptorily prescribes two sermons, and virtually proscribes catechizing. And yet there can be no doubt which of the two our Church, and the reformers of our Liturgy preferred; as little is there which will most build up our congregations in the faith: yet now are we to have persons of any or no faith prescribing in these things. "Will ye have the priesthood also?"

This, perhaps, is the most flagrant violation of Church principle in this bill; if we wish to have *civil* authority for any purpose, we must of course come to this assembly; but that this assembly, such as it now is, should assume the initiative in altering the character of the services of the Church, is intolerable. This too is a fruit of the Commission.

Yet neither is it sparing in the details of interference with Episcopal duties, or in assigning a lay authority to which the exercise of his spiritual authority is to be submitted;—regulations in keeping with the only addition made in the House of Commons to the so-called “Established Church Bill,” whereby it was

“enacted that the Commissioners shall prepare such a scheme as shall seem best adapted for preventing the appointments of any clergymen not fully conversant with the Welsh language to any benefice with cure of souls in Wales, where the majority of the inhabitants do not understand English.”

Will the Commissioners have next to prepare a scheme, whereby incompetent persons shall be excluded from the ministry, or will politicians regulate the frequency of our communions, as well as of our sermons, or direct the Bishop as to his confirmations as well as his ordinations? The Plurality Bill shows no inclination to stop short. Thus, if the Bishop of a diocese, or two Bishops of neighbouring dioceses, wish to unite two livings (a power which the Third Report recognises as belonging to the Bishop) the lay Commission is to inquire and to report to her majesty in council (the council being the said Commissioners,) and it is to be *lawful* for her majesty to unite them; i. e. a parliament thus composed is to give her majesty, the head of the Church, power to do an ecclesiastical office, the office of a Bishop; only her majesty is not to have power, except in such cases in “which the parliament recommends:” in like way, if benefices are to be disunited, wholly (§ 14) or partially (§ 16), the said Commissioners are again called in: and in apportioning the endowments are to “consult the patrons,” but not the Bishop (§ 17). The same body is to alter the boundaries of parishes, separate chapels of ease, settle the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, dues, rates, pews, thereon depending, with the Bishop (§ 19), and make supplemental orders without him (§ 20). The same body is to be Archbishop over the Archbishop, for as the Bishop is to transmit copies of certain licenses to the Archbishop, so the Archbishop is to transmit the same, or such as himself grants, to her majesty in council, i. e. to this same body; and there it may be revoked (§ 41); and as he is to decide finally in the cases in which the Bishop remits the fines for non-residence which this Act prescribes, so this body is



to decide as to those in which he (the Archbishop) remits them to his clergy (§ 47); to the same body the Bishop is annually to return lists of residents and non-residents, and also of all cases where he does not exercise the powers now given to him, to require incumbents of incomes above 150*l.* to take up money to build residences (§ 55); or if he do not sequestrate vacant livings whereon there is no residence (§ 67).

A year and a half ago the Bishop of Exeter set forth plainly to his clergy, the character of this invasion of the Episcopal office; his warning, and every word of his, is well known in the quarters whence this bill proceeds; yet after the breathing-time of a year, it is still persisted in. It is in the way, to use his concluding energetic words, "little short of putting the Episcopacy of the Church of England into Commission."\*

This is only an earnest of what will be; a legislative is much wanted for the Church, and the want is felt; we have no authoritative canons, no discipline, no means of adapting ourselves to the altered state of society and population,—none of commanding the energies of powerfully-stirred but unregulated minds, which since not employed by the Church are turned against her,—no means of finding nor of securing any adequate knowledge in our candidates for orders,—none of educating the increasing middling classes; and the education of the lower, which, as being less costly has almost alone been attended to, is, on account of our neglect, passing out of our hands; uniformity among the clergy is thought impossible; the solemn worship of our Church is neglected because we have but few daily to offer it. We have our old institutions awakened or awakening from their slumbers, into which they were cast by the Revolution, and diffusing good as far as they extend, but no means of extending their usefulness beyond their present confined limits; on the other hand, we have the fresh activity finding vents for itself, since it is undirected, confusing the Church, if within her, weakening her if without; societies taking the initiative for every purpose under the sun: if the Lord's-day is to be decently observed, we have a society; if animals not to be cruelly treated, a society; if Church-rates to be opposed or defended, a society; if Church-legislation, a lay society; and the ultimate end of these societies is to obtain acts of parliament, instead of canons; societies are our Episcopacy, and newspapers our rules of faith.†

This state of things cannot last without the dissolution of the Church; it can be remedied, under God, only by the Church herself, as His instrument; but remedies or palliatives, for some

\* Charge, p. 34.

† See Church of the Fathers in *Brit. Mag.* Feb. 1838.

things, there must be ; somewhere there must be legislation ; the successive parliaments have, for years, been teeming with legislation for the Church ; and bill after bill has been abandoned from the impossibility of legislating for her there ; both the great political parties are weary of the difficulty, and fear the responsibility (the responsibility alas ! towards men mostly, not towards God) of legislating for the Church ; they would be glad to get rid of it ; the Commission has shown no disinclination to receive multifarious duties ; in a short time, if things go on thus, each ecclesiastical measure will be absorbed into the Commission ; we shall live under the supremacy of the Commission ; it will be our legislative, executive, the ultimate appeal of our bishops ; it will absorb our Episcopate ; the prime minister will be our Protestant pope.

This progress of things is curiously, and it may be for the Church, happily illustrated by the “draft of a Fifth Report prepared by the ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the bill to be founded on it.

It was well known in the course of last year that the Episcopal Commissioners had at last been startled by the attempt on the part of the ministers of the crown to despoil the Church of her property in Church-rates, and to apply to this end part of the chapter property. This was against the compact, upon which the Ecclesiastical Commission was founded, viz. that all the income thence arising should be employed for “the efficiency of the established Church ;” now it was to be employed to gratify the political dissenters. The bishops then on the Commission saw, it is supposed, how precarious the tenure of the confiscated property would be, if once in the hands of a body, which the minister of the day could command ; they drew back in time ; refused, it is understood, to sit on the Commission after that time (March, 1837) ; would proceed no further with the work, and finally left any materials they were employed upon, unfinished ; would not sign them, and allowed the Commission to expire after the demise of the crown, without proceeding further. The Church consequently was re-assured, the cathedrals were regarded as saved ; it was *known* that the Episcopal Commissioners had abandoned all notion of touching the chapters. The episcopal body was now again thus far re-united ; and it is accordingly against the will of the Episcopal Commissioners that Lord John Russell has got possession of this unfinished draft ; it is against the whole Bench of Bishops that he is proceeding with it.

Of the draft itself little need be said ; we are persuaded that it never could have been signed by the bishops, in the state in which

it now is; it is a naked attempt to bribe the present members of chapters to give up their opposition to the confiscation of the property whereof they are trustees,—in most cases sworn trustees,—by providing for all their selfish interests; and not only this, but (as they would deserve) they are taunted with the admirable terms, which by their opposition they have obtained for themselves. They, or rather the public, are told

“The effect of the modified proposition which we now offer (viz. that the chapter patronage should not be transferred to the bishop ‘until after the expiration of the interest of every existing member’) will be, that while the crown and the bishops will immediately relinquish their right of patronage, with respect to the preferments which it is proposed to suppress, the existing members of the chapter will, during their incumbency, retain theirs with respect to the benefices, the advowsons of which belong to them in their corporate character; and in some chapters they will enjoy, as the numbers of the canons shall be reduced, an increase of patronage proportionate to that reduction.”

A sentence so flagrantly unjust, and imputing such sordid motives to the members of chapters, could never have received the deliberate sanction of the respected individuals who form the Episcopal portion of the Commission.\* They knew that the members of the chapters, as many as did object to this transfer, did not object to it for their own selfish sakes; they had before them the memorial of the delegates, or members, of nineteen chapters,† in which they professed their willingness to surrender their patronage “if any great good appeared likely to result;”‡ they knew that of fifteen chapters, who mentioned this subject, one§ only, and that the most yielding as to the future, made any claim on the part of the present prebends; the grounds of objection were, the arbitrary stretch of authority in touching upon this subject, which had not been included in their Commission;|| the invasion of rights;¶ the unjust imputation cast upon the cathedrals, as if they were proved delinquents\*\* or more so than other

\* The language remarkably resembles that of Lord John Russell in the debates, July, 25, 1836.—*Mirror of Parliament*, 2539.

† All the English Chapters but York, Hereford, Norwich, Peterborough, and Westminster. The names of those present are given in the *Brit. Mag.*, Aug. 1836.

‡ *Cathedral Memorials*, pp. 3, 4.

§ *Rochester* was willing to relinquish a proportion of its future patronage, supposing the prebends to be suppressed, but claimed it in full for existing members (2d *Mem. ib.* p. 59). *Norwich* and *Salisbury* treat subordinately of the injustice to vested rights, p. 46.

|| *Canterbury Memorial*, *ib.* p. 13; *Lichfield*, p. 104; *Salisbury*, p. 127.

¶ *Canterbury*, *ib.* p. 14; *Carlisle*, p. 24; *Norwich*, p. 46; *Worcester*, p. 66; *Lichfield*, p. 104; *Lincoln*, p. 112; *Salisbury*, p. 127; *Wells*, p. 136; *Windsor*, p. 128.

\*\* *Carlisle*, p. 24; *Norwich*, p. 46; *Westminster*, p. 69; *Exeter*, p. 92; *Lincoln*, p. 112; *Salisbury*, p. 132.

patrons;\* the suspiciousness of the enactments; the tendency to produce heartburnings between orders of men who ought to be united†; *the positive detriment to the Church*, in that this division of patronage was beneficial,‡ and the prebendaries were likely and *had met with*, and placed in spheres of usefulness, valuable men who had escaped the observation of the bishop.¶ They professed also their willingness to place their patronage under stricter regulations, which should guard against occasional abuse.§ They disclaimed insisting on retaining it for their own purposes;¶ they professed to be ready to make personal sacrifices for the public good;\*\* the Chapter of Ely closed their most valuable and impressive remonstrance, with the solemn statement that “being members of an ancient and venerable institution, dedicated to the service of God, they have learnt to regard the permanence of their establishment in efficiency and dignity, with feelings of far deeper interest than their own personal vested rights.” What an answer to this would it have been from bishops, to tell them to “go and be content,” for that “while the crown and the bishops will immediately relinquish their right of patronage,” the existing members of chapters would “enjoy an increase of patronage proportionate to the reduction!” happy enjoyment truly, which in former times was held a curse, to be the “last of his race,” and happy recommendation of bishops, as if nepotism was the sole, true, legitimate end of patronage, and they wished to guide the canons to be nepotists! We are convinced that bishops never would have signed such a document as this; we should grieve to be convinced that they ever joined in drawing it up; from statesmen, it would be but the use of their natural and accustomed instrument—corruption; but we should be loath to suppose that any of the spiritual heads of the Church could think so meanly of their brethren, as to deem them accessible to such motives, or thinking them so, should tempt and degrade them, and with them, their ministry, their teaching, and the Church, by appealing to their base and selfish passions.

And yet this is the characteristic of the draft; the chapters had

\* Memorials, p. 4; Ely, p. 35; Norwich, p. 46; Worcester, p. 66; Exeter, p. 82; Lichfield, p. 101.

† Deputation, p. 4; Westminster, p. 69; Salisbury, p. 127 & 132.

‡ Deputation, p. 4; Carlisle, p. 24; Exeter, p. 81.

¶ Lincoln, pp. 112, 113; Wells, p. 136.

§ Deputation, p. 4; Canterbury, (provided they applied to all patrons) p. 14; Bristol, p. 17; Ely, p. 32; Westminster, p. 69; Exeter, p. 82 & 92.

¶ Bristol, *ib.* p. 17. “They disclaim all appeal to it as an interest, spiritual patronage was never founded on this principle and ought never so to be possessed, and they would gladly look to the purest and most effective exercise of it,”—*Westminster*, p. 69.

\*\* Bristol, *ib.* p. 17.

collectively, as well as individually, protested against the recommendations of the Commission;\* they had all protested against the principle of reduction. Even the prebendaries of Lichfield and Chester, who were to be reduced from six to the received number of four, but on account of the poverty of the foundations to be allowed to retain all their funds, and Lichfield to receive some increase from the non-residentiary stalls, protested against this change, as an injury.† Such chapters as had minor canons, or the minor canons themselves, protested against the arbitrary dissolution of their corporations.‡ Some had specified the injustice of such sweeping measures against the whole chapter body, without, or even refusing, information; had protested against the transfer of property from diocese to diocese, or to places with which their cathedral had no connection, in disregard of the intentions of the founder; against the augmentation of lay and marketable patronage with the spoils of the cathedrals;§ against the wastefulness, precariousness, and injustice of a common fund:|| they had hinted, as respectfully as they might, at the sanction of oaths, whereby their property was guaranteed to them.¶ Some of them had dwelt also on the positive detriment likely to result from the diminution; they had appealed to facts to show that the proposed number of the canons\*\* was inadequate; they had desired to be allowed to give further information;†† they proposed to show a judicious system of annexation,‡‡ together with the augmentations of bene-

\* Those of Chester, as a pecuniary injury to themselves; the chapter of Lichfield, on account chiefly of the inefficiency of four, but taking the grounds also of the Memorials from Canterbury, Winchester, Exeter and Salisbury.

† The fullest and most important of these, next to the General Memorial, are those from Canterbury and Ely; but different points are well touched in others, as those of Bristol, Exeter, Lincoln, Westminster, Winchester. Most also supply some useful evidence.

‡ We have noted among the Chapter Memorials the General Memorial, Bristol, Ely, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln.

§ Gen. Mem., Rochester, Worcester, Exeter twice, Lincoln, Norwich, Oxford. "The dean and chapter most earnestly deprecate the transfer of the revenues of cathedrals to any but their own daughter churches, as subversive of the whole principle of ecclesiastical endowment, and a manifest violation of the known intentions of the founder."—*Lincoln Mem. ib. p. 45.*

|| Gen. Mem., Canterbury, Worcester, Exeter, Lincoln.

¶ Gen. Mem. Canterbury, Bristol, Rochester, Lincoln. The words of the Chapter of Lincoln are again much to be attended to (Mem. p. 110, 111): "Setting aside for a moment the question of right to make this transfer, we respectfully urge that, by the raising of all such contributions, the bounty of the founders is pro tanto perverted from its original design; one patron enriched at the expense of another; payments made to the Church in one place applied to spiritual purposes in another; and property concentrated and converted into money; so rendering it less safe from rapacious usurpation than lands scattered and divided committed to the immediate guardianship of several unconnected owners."

\*\* Gen. Mem., Canterbury, Worcester, Exeter, Hereford, Lincoln.

†† See above, Lichfield (p. 103) joins in the same.

‡‡ Gen. Mem., Canterbury, Durham, Ely, Norwich, Rochester, Exeter, Lichfield,

fices of which they held the impropriations.\* Some appealed† to what they *had* actually done in behalf of poor or populous parishes connected with them. They were willing to make personal sacrifices, provided they might transmit their numbers undiminished to posterity, and the foundations, whose efficiency it was the professed object of this Commission to promote, might be retained unimpaired. Thus far they had no apparent selfish interest; and we could have wished that they had confined themselves to such topics, and not touched upon what, though equally unjust, was an injustice felt by them as well as their successors; yet they looked upon this in part as spoliation also, in part as casting a stigma upon them; and so they claimed their patronage and the prebendal houses, on the same principle as the rest. The "draft of the Fifth Report" accordingly proposes to concede those things, in which any could be selfishly concerned; but the patronage only so far as they were selfishly concerned, and every thing else, oaths, statutes, wills of founder, their own inherent rights, and the rights of the dioceses, future efficiency of the foundations, petitions for inquiry, are swept away; "they saw no reasons to outweigh those on which they had founded their recommendations."

These concessions to supposed selfishness are a fresh aggravation of the arbitrariness of the past dealings; they have also their own peculiar inconveniences; the chapter is, during its period of decay, no longer to be responsible; but private irresponsible individuals, who may happen to survive, are to proceed to fill up both the stalls (as far as these remained) and the livings, which have hitherto been filled by a responsible body, the chapters; that which the chapters deprecate, the invasion of rights, and the undeserved stigma, is left; that which they asked not for, or scarcely any asked for, is flung ungraciously at them, as a "sop for Cerberus." We should be persuaded on this ground alone, that this "draft of a Report" never could have been intended by the Episcopal Commissioners to be presented, that we have not here a finished record of their opinions. It is an *apocryphal* document, artfully and surreptitiously obtained; and at the same time contrived to com-

the last with reference especially to the union of prebendal [non-residentiaries] stalls to the livings belonging to the prebends themselves, [as we understand has been seen to be advantageous elsewhere,] or to churches in populous towns within the diocese, under the patronage of the bishop, as has been done in two instances in our own cathedral, with good effect, as well as of two of the residentiaryships to archdeaconries, and two to livings in the gift of the bishop."

\* Gen. Mem., Canterbury, Ely, Norwich, Oxford, Rochester, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield.

† We have noted Durham, Ely, Rochester, Lichfield; others may have escaped us, since we know that they might have alleged the same with truth.

mit, if possible, the spiritual head of the Church, to measures in which he was for some time involved, but which there was reason to believe that he had repudiated; and this belief is strengthened by the artfulness of the contrivance. He has as yet, and we trust may continue, to escape the toils laid for his feet. For this history, however, at least such parts of it as could with propriety be given, we must refer to Dr. Spry's seasonable pamphlet. We may now therefore consider ourselves in the same state as if this draft had never been prepared, for we *know*, that subsequently to the drawing up of this draft, whoever may have prepared it, the Episcopal Commissioners had, and felt, reason to draw back, and saw that the sums to be obtained from the cathedrals could not be safely trusted with a Commission, which was to be under the control of the minister for the day. Such as it is, it and the bill engrafted upon it, (which we understand is still further to despoil the chapter property,) are the production of a single political personage, not of the Commission.\*

Bad then as this draft in itself is, and tricking as the contrivance and correspondence was, which drew it from the drawers of the extinct Commission, its production places the Church in a better position, by its concession of every thing which can be termed a *selfish* right, (denying only the *vested* right of continuing our succession unimpaired as we received it,) the chapters have now free scope; they have nothing to gain for themselves; and if they gain for posterity, they must lose for their selfish interests, for sacrifices must be made: they have pledged themselves to augment poorer benefices out of their funds, to submit their patronage to such useful restrictions as may be devised, at least in common with other patrons; they have professed to hold patronage, as a trust, so they must the more avoid what might seem an abuse of that trust. Thus then they may proceed to the struggle for our ancient foundations, clear and unincumbered of all imputations of selfish motives and private ends. Still more, the unseemly and painful scene of a struggle of one part of the episcopal order against the other, or of the inferior order of the clergy against a Commission, in which (though a minority) the metropolitan and some of their leading bishops were unhappily joined, is now happily removed. The Church may again be united against one, who has in many cases joined the avowed enemies of the Church, and depends upon them for support.

But, it may be asked, can nothing be done for the heathen, or worse than heathen, population of our large towns? Is part of

\* Besides the late Bishop of Hereford, the Bishops of Exeter, Rochester, and Winchester have, in their charges to their clergy, spoken plainly against the recommendation of the Commission; the Bishop of Durham against part of it.

the Church to remain in comparative or real affluence, and part in its destitute condition? By no means! Only be it done honestly, lest a curse be carried thither instead of a blessing; yea, lest our whole land be cursed! Robbery is no acceptable oblation to God. Spoliation of the Church is not the way to encourage others to bestow their treasures on the Church. This, then, must be laid down as a first principle, that there is no right to disturb the pious gifts of our forefathers, because *we* think we could employ them better. If we see holy ends whereon to employ them, give we of our own, not of theirs. We dare not then bring the several plans into comparison, on the score of *expediency*; one is righteous, the other is unrighteous; but then also (as generally happens) the unrighteous plan is unwise, and the righteous plan wise; and that, not only taking into account the distant results, but the present.

There *is*, then, a righteous plan for removing many of our difficulties, a plan long ago recommended, and not long ago revived by one, now a Commissioner, and the adoption of which was, about three years and a half before the date of this Commission, much facilitated by a bill framed by another Commissioner,—the strictly legal use of the ecclesiastical impropriations.

The following account is chiefly taken from Kennett's interesting "*History of Impropriations*," which is largely extracted by Burn, art. Appropriation, and much of it admirably condensed in the pamphlet by the Earl of Harrowby.

The inadequate income of the parochial clergy is owing, as is generally known, in great measure, to impropriations; and to these, therefore, it is natural to look in the first instance, for their relief. The oldest system of Church property was, that it was paid into the hands of the bishop, who had the whole care of the diocese, and whose deputies the priests were; gradually portions were detached; and then came in the custom of "*appropriating the tithes*," to different religious bodies who undertook the spiritual care of those parishes. This was in itself no evil, although often abused; the laity trusted to these, as being at the time holy bodies, to provide them with ministers better than they could find for themselves; and the very extensive continuance of the practice shows that it was found beneficial; the current of charity will not set in one way without a reason. Those foundations became the richest, which had most reputation of holiness. The appropriations and patronage went virtually together; in most of these cases they were given to monasteries, in others to collegiate bodies. There existed also a check against avaricious encroachment; the vicarages were at first well endowed, and afterwards the bishop had the power to augment them,—



“ This power being expressly reserved in the instrument of appropriation, or, if not, always thought an antecedent right of the bishop, from the original constitution of the Church, continued down and confirmed by the decrees of general and provincial councils. And even the common law of the land (which in ecclesiastical matters was founded on equity and the custom of the Church), did allow and enforce this practice; the Year-books affirming that the ordinary may increase or diminish the vicar's portion. And for aught we find upon record, though this episcopal right was too often evaded by resort to the sanctuary of the monks at Rome; yet it was never questioned in any of our ecclesiastical or civil courts, before the Reformation.”

The bishop could even, on great occasions, disappropriate or restore all the profits to the vicar.

After the Reformation, the impropriations were of three classes; those which the crown retained in its own hands; those which it granted to laymen; and those which it restored to the Church, in that it made over to certain cathedrals or collegiate churches, the whole property of some of the dissolved monasteries, re-founding the ancient foundation, under the form of a cathedral or a collegiate church. From this time not only were the *lay* impropriations lost to the Church, but even the duty of providing *out* of them for the maintenance of a minister, to which this property had always been subject, was neglected; it was not to be expected, that they who had gained the goods of the Church by sacrilege, would care about the Church; and the Church, who had not power to prevent the spoliation, was not in a state to put in force the laws to which this sort of property, in whatever hands, was subject. They were, however, and are still, regarded as spiritual property;\* even as late as Charles I., the ablest lawyers† were of opinion, that the bishop's power to order the necessary augmentations out of them still continued, and but for the Rebellion it would have been enforced.

Much more, in the case of those in the hands of ecclesiastics; for, in that they were granted back to spiritual persons, or these were made to take them from the crown in exchange for manors, it was evidently meant that they should be liable to the same responsibilities which they were before. Accordingly, ever since the Reformation, bishops and deans and chapters have from time to time augmented the vicarages out of the impropriations,‡ and

\* See authorities in Kennett on Impropriations, p. 188, 9. “ Hence they are not within the statute of mortmain.” Plowd. Com. f. 499. “ Appropriate Churches are no otherwise in the hands of the laity than as spiritual livings.” Spelm. on Tithes, ib.

† Archbishop Laud's letter to Bishop Williams, ap. Kennett, Appendix, p. 43. “ Morton, Bishop of Durham, held the same, upon the authority of Lord Coventry, Mr. Noy, and Sir H. Martin.” Lord Harrowby, from Kennett, p. 145.

‡ See a number of instances, ap. Kennett.

the power of the bishop to enforce this has been recognized.\* Dr. Gibson † says,

“ It seems agreed on all hands, that the ordinary hath power to oblige *spiritual* impropiators to augment vicarages, according to the case of Hitchcot and Thornburgh, 9 Car., and that the lessee (who held for lives, according to the statute of 32 Hen. VIII.) came in, subject to the same charge. It is true, this was an appropriation which had never come to the king by any statute of dissolution ; but that circumstance of having been conveyed to the king, made no difference with regard to the jurisdiction of the bishop, as long as they were reconveyed to a spiritual hand, as appears from the case of the Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph, in the 12 Jac.”

The subject of impropriations, the difficulties involved by them, and the necessity of making compensation, occur in every reign, from the time of their first dilapidation, to Queen Anne, although nothing was enforced as to the *lay portion*, except during the Usurpation, when Cromwell confiscated, for this purpose, the impropriations of the so-called delinquents. A most important measure, however, was adopted by Charles II. on his restoration (by the advice, probably, of Lord Clarendon, Archbishop Juxon, and Bishop Sheldon),‡ when he admonished, by letter, all ecclesiastical bodies or individuals holding impropriations,

“ To provide for the augmentation of such cures, that they who are immediately attending upon the performance of ministerial offices in every parish, may have a competent provision, that no lease be granted by them or their *successors*, until it be provided that the said vicarages or curates' places shall amount to 80*l.*, or *more if it will bear it*, in good form of law settled upon them and their successors ; that the bishop shall employ the authority, *belonging to him as ordinary*, for the augmentation of vicarages and curacies ; and that they and their successors shall report every year to the archbishop of the province, how these commands had been obeyed.”

This most seasonable injunction it was the wish of Lord Harrowby to procure to be re-enacted *prospectively* for the present times ; and in 1810 he addressed, anonymously, a printed Letter to Mr. Perceval, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, in which he gives, in an abridged form, from Kennett and Burn, a very lucid and compact history of the several attempts to remedy the injury inflicted upon the Church at the Reformation, by the alienating of the impropriations. The remarks with which he introduces his plan, will be read with great interest.

\* Kennett, pp. 49, 50 ; and Stillingfleet, *Eccl. Cases*, ib.

† Burn, p. 77, quoted by Lord Harrowby, p. 14.

‡ Lord Harrowby, p. 31.

"To those who are desirous, in every proposal respecting the Church, *insistere super antiquas vias*, it is also a strong objection, that, at the different periods when the situation of the clergy has been under the consideration of the legislature, a measure so obvious, and at first sight so plausible [as that of the raising of the tenths and first-fruits to their real value, for the benefit of the poor livings], never appears to have been seriously entertained. We must, therefore, either entirely abandon the hope of deriving any relief from the funds of the Church, or we must resort either to reasoning or to history for some better mode. *The latter will usually be found, upon such subjects, the safest instructor.* If we follow the footsteps of our ancestors, we shall in general proceed, *if not rapidly, at least securely.* Our edifice will stand the firmer, if it is erected upon ancient foundations."\*

This Letter was re-printed with his name in 1831, in the prospect that "the affairs of the Church seemed likely to occupy the early attention of parliament and the public," and in the same year was passed the Archbishop of Canterbury's act (1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45) "to extend the Provisions of the Act of 29 Car. II. for confirming and perpetuating Augmentations made by Ecclesiastical Persons to small Vicarages."

This act proposed great advantages; for it was an evil which before much withheld the liberality of such persons, that there was no security that their successors would continue what they had begun; from the mode of leasing ecclesiastical property, such augmentations, unless made prospectively, are made to great disadvantage; and yet, if made prospectively, another generation might come in, and take to themselves what these had intended for the benefit of the incumbents. The act of Will. IV. remedied this, by enabling ecclesiastical persons to endow in perpetuity any church or chapel within the parish of which they hold the impropriation, out of that *impropriation*, or to annex any portion of *land* to any church or chapel of which they had the patronage; so that the annual value should not be made to exceed 300*l.*, or, including surplice fees, 350*l.*

This valuable act commenced its operation from Oct. 15, 1831; the returns to the ecclesiastical revenues were to be made up to the end of that same year. We have consequently no official information of the extent to which ecclesiastical persons have availed themselves of it. Under the head, however of "expected increase or decrease of income," notice that they have, or intend, as occasion offers, to avail themselves of this act, is given by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; the Bishops of Durham, Gloucester, Lichfield and Coventry, Lincoln, London, Norwich, Winchester; as also by the Chapters of Durham, Exeter, Oxford, Rochester, Westminster, and Windsor. This does not include

\* Lord Harrowby, p. 11.

all who have made augmentations, since, as before noticed, Ely, in its Memorial, mentions that it had augmented its livings, yet gives no notice of it here. The act was so recent, that some chapters doubtless had not matured their plans; some did not take it into account. Two also of the best endowed colleges in the two universities, St. Mary Magdalen, Oxford, and Trinity College, Cambridge, (the latter of which is largely endowed with impropriations,) had, for some time, been augmenting their incumbencies, and to the latter the act in question would be especially acceptable.

The extent also to which this plan, at so early a stage, had been carried by different of these persons or bodies should not be overlooked: the augmentations of the late Bishop of Durham were of so much moment, that in the so-called "Established Church Bill," provision was expressly made that his uncompleted arrangements should not be affected by it; he had completed grants to the amount of 1170*l.* per annum; the Dean and Chapter of Durham state, that "their augmentations, exclusive of those granted previously to 1831, amounting to 1734*l.* 2*s.* 9*d.*, are estimated at 3000*l.* per annum;"\* those of the Archbishop of Canterbury already granted are 1040*l.* per annum; the income of the Bishop of Lincoln, it is said, will be "*considerably diminished*;" "the annual income of Winchester is reduced 400*l.* per annum; and it is intended to augment all the small livings in the gift of the see to 200*l.* per annum;" the same amount has been fixed as the minimum by the Chapters of Westminster and Rochester (although, in the latter case, the livings so circumstanced are few); "the expenditure of Windsor will be much increased by the augmentations lately made to small livings;" the grants of Christ Church, Oxford, under this act, including two before let as beneficial leases to the vicar, independently of its annual grants, amount to about 2000*l.* per annum.†

These, it is to be recollected, are specimens only, and at the beginning of things; chapters are not, at present, even *permitted* to raise their vicarages, by way of endowment, to the highest scale contemplated by the Commissioners; much more would doubtless be ultimately done, if permitted; the practice of libe-

\* Eccl. Revenues' Report, p. 14.

† We may here add one or two facts as to cathedrals which we happen to know; the chapter of Durham began its augmentations at the Restoration, and has, ever since, granted large sums for the building of churches and endowments: in Christ Church, Oxford, 16,000*l.* has, during the last hundred years, been expended in the augmentation of small livings from monies left by two canons, Dr. South and Stratford; and, during the last thirty-six, the dean and chapter have of their own contributed 14,000*l.* more. They are now in the habit of applying about 1000*l.* per annum to the augmentation of the incomes of the incumbents, or the erection of parsonage-houses.

ality, through the blessing of God, strengthens it; the eye opens wider to its duties and responsibilities, and takes in a wider range; objects are seen, after a time, to fall within it, which were not perceived, until its faculties were practised and its attention fixed. Then, also, persons gradually fall in with any diminution of income resulting from it; a sacrifice, when made, is found never to cost so much as in prospect was expected. We wish only for time for the deans and chapters, and we doubt not such kindness or justice would be shown to their incumbents, as might become an example and a stimulant to others also.

There are also several advantages attending this augmentation by the bodies themselves. We need not mention the greater security of the property, and the absence of the expense of a board, &c., which would make a considerable deduction in the case of a general fund, nor the justice of considering primarily and without any comparison with other places, those from which the tithes are derived, or which are connected with these foundations; we will advert for the time to two points of calculation only, which may verify that the most righteous plan is the most beneficial, and attest even in this way the sound policy of honesty.

These are, 1st, the extent of benefit, 2d, speed in completing it; so that we shall have not only "*bis dat qui cito dat*," but "*bis dat*" and "*cito dat*" too, literally, twice as much, and twice as soon.

The advantage in point of "extent" results from the mode of letting of this property. It is let on what was formerly among the laity also the (or at least a very) ordinary mode of leasing lands in England, on terms of twenty-one years, renewable every seven, or on three lives, renewable whenever one drops. In this tenure, it is a reversionary income which is sold, whenever the lease is filled up, the immediate property belonging already to the lessee; it is the value of seven years after the fourteen still remaining in the lease, or of a life in addition to two lives by which the lease is still held. This tenure is, of course, disadvantageous to the lessor, in that the money is received so long beforehand; and it has, consequently, been for the most part abandoned by the laity, although some instances still remain, at least, in the West of England; the clergy have retained it, partly because it is more suited to their profession, in that it avoids much of the business attending the management of property leased at rack-rent, partly because being life-holders themselves, their own incomes might be seriously affected by any great or sudden change, partly out of regard to their lessees, who, in some cases, have held of them ever since or before the Reformation. These leases are also beneficial leases, in order that the lessee may have an interest in the property, and be their almoner to the poor. The

ordinary ratio, then, we believe, of the sum received to the ultimate value of the property is as one and a half to seven;\* in common language, a fine of about one year and a half is taken for adding seven years to the lease. In the case of lives, the sum received is in proportion less. In proportion, then to the disadvantages of this tenure, are the facilities of augmenting vicarages by the act 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45. For this enables ecclesiastical persons to attach, *in reversion*, to the vicarages or curacies the property thus forestalled, so that, by diminishing their own present income, they can add, at the expiration of the lease, what shall bear the proportion of seven to one and a half. Thus, by foregoing fines to the amount of 3000*l.* a-year, they deduct from their income, on the whole seven years, 4500*l.*; i. e. for 4500*l.* every seven years, or, dispersed over the seven years, about 650*l.* per annum, they can, after fourteen years, add to their vicarages 3000*l.* per annum, or in the course of the seven years 21,000*l.* At this rate, the 120,000 a-year, which the Commissioners think to obtain from their immense confiscation of offices and property, *might* be obtained, *without the sacrifice of a single stall*, at the expense of 25,714*l.* per annum, diffused over the whole body of ecclesiastical impropiators, archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters, corporations sole, non-residentiaries, colleges.

It may be objected to this that the lessees would be injured. In what we have said, we have put only a hypothetical case, for, if the stalls were preserved, there would not be the same occasion for raising the 120,000*l.* per annum. But this is certain both in equity and law, that the lessees received their leases under certain conditions; and, of these, a primary duty is the adequate provision for the benefices whence the tithes accrue; the holders of impropriations could grant leases on no other terms, for they themselves received them on this condition. But, besides this, *as a fact*, the great proportion of holders of Ecclesiastical leases are the landed aristocracy; men, as a body, far too high-minded and high-principled to consider their own diminution of interest in the property, when the object of that diminution is the better provision for the spiritual wants of the people; and that, in the very parishes where their own property is situate. On the contrary, we well *know*, that the lessees receive these propositions gladly, that holding the rest of their estate leased to them on the same terms as before, they are *glad* to relinquish a portion for the improvement of the respective cures.

\* The deduction from the See of Canterbury for reversionary augmentations to the amount of 1040*l.* is given (Report I. p. 5) at 222*l.*, which is in this ratio. It may vary perhaps from one year and a half to two years in practice, though the lessors are under no obligation to adhere to any rule, nor is it made known.

2. With regard to *time*, the Commissioners thought it necessary, even in the Second Report, to guard against any expectations of speedy benefit from this plan.

“ Whatever resources may be obtained, by carrying into effect the measures which we are prepared to recommend, it should be borne in mind, that, as the operation of those measures must of necessity be gradual, so also must be the additions which will result from them to our existing means. We are therefore desirous of not appearing to encourage any expectation of a large immediate accession to the funds, which are now available to the augmentation of poor benefices, and the creation of new ones. It is, however, to be hoped, that the sacrifices, which will be required from the cathedral and collegiate churches of the country, will have the effect of stimulating individual benevolence, to contribute towards the accomplishment of these most important ends.”

And, since this warning, the period when any benefit could be reaped is still further delayed by the provisions which they thought themselves bound in equity to make in the Fourth Report, whereby some of the stalls are to be again filled up before their final suppression.

“ Why,” asks Dr. Spry,\* “ should a financial measure be recommended when immediate funds are required, which the plainest principles of justice make it necessary to clog with provisions rendering it utterly incapable of furnishing them? Or, what are the merits of a plan, which can afford no real assistance to the present generation, and will only mock the future by raising expectations that never can be effectually realized?”

The only *immediate* prospect held out in the Report, is from the “ stimulating of individual benevolence;” a remarkable and well calculated way, doubtless, of “ stimulating individual benevolence,” by setting before their eyes that trusts are no longer held sacred, and that the endowments they bestow will be alienated from the objects whereon they bestow them, so soon as the penury of posterity, treading in our steps, should think it expedient to divert them. However, the Commissioners look forward to a distant day, whereas the present possessors of cathedral property have professed their willingness to concur in any plan for improving the vicarages of which they hold the impropriations; they have in part begun to do it; they received the property under condition of so doing, and their obligation is recognised by ecclesiastical law. What they so do, would not only be done with great advantage, but would commence at the expiration of their present leases.

With regard to the extent of the benefit thus to be derived, it

\* Observations, p. 30.

appears that there are towards 4692 impropriations in England and Wales, 38 of which are held by the crown, 1806 by ecclesiastical foundations, bishops, deans and chapters, non-residentiaries, minor canons, universities, colleges, and hospitals, 2552 by private owners, 43 by municipal corporations, 132 have been wholly restored to the vicarages, and 121 in part. Of these, the principles of Lord Harrowby's plan would immediately apply to the 1806 held by ecclesiastical foundations,\* towards 3-7ths of the whole : and when the church-foundations were thus setting in earnest about the benefiting the parishes, whereof they held the impropriations, we cannot doubt that the crown would, if the case were set earnestly before it, free itself of the responsibility of holding spiritual property, i. e. holding back from God what is His. The Archbishop of Canterbury once addressed a queen,† warning her that

“ those kings, her predecessors, and many private Christians, have also given to God, and to this Church, much land, and many immunities, which they might have given to those of their families, and did not, but gave them for ever as an absolute right and sacrifice to God : and, with these immunities and lands they have entailed a curse upon the alienators of them ; God prevent your majesty and your successors from being liable to that curse, which will cleave unto church-lands, as the leprosy to the Jews.”

He reminded her, also, of

“ what is already become visible in many families, ‘ that church-land, added to an ancient and just inheritance, has proved like a moth fretting a garment, and secretly consumed both ;’ or, ‘ like the eagle that stole a coal from the altar, and thereby set her nest on fire, which consumed both her young eagles and herself that stole it.’ ”

He reminded her, also, respectfully, that

“ a part of the Church's rights, added to the vast treasure left to her father by his father, hath been conceived to bring an unavoidable consumption upon both, notwithstanding all his diligence to preserve them.”

Since that time her father's house has become extinct ; the houses of Stuart, Orange, Denmark, have passed away ; we cannot doubt that it would be for the stability of the present throne,

\* Lord Harrowby himself excepted colleges, for fear that any great reduction might diminish too much the means of the education of the clergy : the colleges, however, received their impropriations on these express conditions ; and, as they received them by gift with this condition, not by purchase, the plea set up for the laymen does not apply to them. They are altogether in the same situation as when they received them, and bound to discharge the trust. Lord Harrowby recognises them as ecclesiastical bodies ; and it is only, as such, that they have any right to tithes, or the University of Durham could have been founded by the late bishop.

† Archbishop Whitgift's noble and eloquent speech to Queen Elizabeth is printed in Kennett, App. p. 18.



were such remains of Church property, as are yet in its hands, restored. The sacrifice is not much; the principle of having clean hands, everything; it has been acted upon, in great measure, in the Channel Islands,\* and we doubt not that it has been through want of attention, that it has not been completed in England.†

But neither would it stop here; we make no *claim* upon laymen,—though we ourselves should not feel at ease, had we, as individuals, any Church property in our hands; but we make no claim; the property has, for the most part, “eaten through” and “eaten up” the families, which first unadvisedly added it to their store; they have perished: the present have, in most cases, obtained it by ordinary purchase, not by the sacrilege of their ancestors. There are, however, other cases,—cases of noble families, who have been allowed to retain it; and we doubt not, that on any general plan of benefiting the parochial cures, they, though not compelled by human law, will, in many cases, feel themselves impelled by the Divine; that they will, out of piety towards God, for the good of the Church, and of *their own families*, give back all, or a part of that which has hitherto brought no blessing to their families, hoping to receive it back in blessing from God. Our forefathers did so; though small in proportion to the whole, “132 impropriations have been wholly restored, 121 in part;” 253 several persons, at least, must have been stirred up to this act of restitution. Why should we think our times so incapable of making the like sacrifice? “Zacchæus restored four-fold,” why should we deem our Christian nobility, sensible as many of them are to feelings of high honour and Christian duty, insensible to the honourable act of restoring that which came to their forefathers unlawfully, (through robbery as well as sacrilege), or to the Christian duty of giving unto God what is His? Why should we think our Protestant nobility incapable of doing that which the despised monks did? We are sure that we should have some instances, at least. We believe that the subject has never been brought forward without some restitution taking place; we look to the 253 restitutions, and take courage;

\* The Ecclesiastical Revenue Report states, (App. p. 47), that “in Jersey and Guernsey the benefices are merely nominal rectories, the incumbent not being entitled, in any case, to more than a portion (generally one-third) of the great tithes, the crown or governor taking the residue; and, in some cases, the whole goes to the crown or governor.” Since that time, in Guernsey, the crown has given back all but about 100*l.* per annum.

† In the parish of Halifax, of which the crown holds the great tithes (whether it collects them or no, we know not), the population in 1831 was 109,899. Church room, 15,730, one-seventh, leaving 62,700 unprovided for; Clergy 18, with incomes (except the vicarage, which is £1678) two of £55 and £76, thirteen under £200, one £250.

we look back to the 253 blessed souls,\* whose "works have followed them," who are now enjoying a portion of the reward, for their sacrifice here; and we cannot think that others will not be joined to them.

Then, farther, whatever be the case of individuals, there is a great debt owed by the nation to God. The Parliament gave to Henry VIII. the power of appropriating, under various pretences, the property of the monasteries, not simply what was given them, as such, but the ancient property of the Church, which was in their keeping; they gave the power to King Henry, hoping to receive back the equivalent, and to be individually sharers in the spoil. The Parliaments extorted from Queen Mary the confirmation of these confiscations;† and, to quote authority, which this age listens to with contentment, and praises his philosophy, Lord Chancellor Bacon:‡

"In my own opinion and sense, I must confess (let me speak it with reverence), that all the Parliaments since 27 and 31 of Hen. VIII. (who gave away impropriations from the Church), seem to me to stand in a sort obnoxious, and obliged to God in conscience, to do somewhat for the Church; to reduce the patrimony thereof to a competency: for since they have debarred Christ's wife of a great part of her dowry, it were reason they made her a competent jointure."

Or is it to be supposed that this age, which idolizes the Baconian philosophy, idolizes also the one blot which stains the memory of its founder, and likes at once his theory and practice, to speculate and to receive bribes?

The Parliament has voted 20,000,000*l.* on the notion of restitution to the slave-holders in the West Indies; why should we think that it would refuse restitution to God? While asked, it devised plans, though they were not realized; let it be asked, not as a favour but as a debt; not as a gift, but as a restitution; not to make a boast of, but to avert the wrath of God, whose Church has been suffering these 300 years, for the spoliation inflicted by a former Parliament, lest He allow the flames, which are at present smothered, but which show themselves visibly here and there, to burst out, and "consume us and our house." Like the eagle, we have "placed our nest in the rocks," but our "latter end" may be, "that we perish for ever." We have placed our nest in the rocks, but, with the flesh of the sacrifice, we have brought

\* The memory of several of these pious persons has been embalmed by Bishop Kennett, in his *Cases of Impropriations*: the restitution of some was occasioned by Sir H. Spelman's impressive "History of Sacrilege."

† As the price of "repealing all statutes, articles, and provisions made against the see apostolic of Rome, since the 20th year of king Henry VIII."—*Kennett*, p. 141.

‡ *Considerations touching the Edification and Purification of the Church of England.*—*ib.* p. 189.

thither the coal which shall consume it; and unless God "send a gracious rain" to extinguish the commencing flames,

"The blackness of ashes shall mark where it stood,  
And the wild mother's scream o'er her famishing brood."

Be the demand made in earnest, and boldly, "in the Name of God;" let the people be taught whence this lack of instruction comes, not from the overgrown incomes of bishops, or from deans and chapters, but from the spendthrift sacrilege of the nation of old, which wasted the inheritance of God, and "consumed it on their lusts," and, we doubt not, that the call will, sooner or later, be answered.

Such are the ulterior prospects, which the acting upon Lord Harrowby's plan opens: how soon those prospects are realized, will depend upon our own earnestness in realizing to ourselves what national sins,\* and the sin of sacrilege, are. We boast of our study of Holy Scriptures, let us read it there; of our Reformers, let men read the martyr Latimer.

With regard, however, to the immediate results, we will compare in some instances the result of Lord Harrowby's plan with that proposed by the Commissioners; augmentation out of the ecclesiastical impropriations with augmentations out of the dean and chapter corporate revenues. And in so doing, we shall show, in some measure, to what extent this relief will go. According to the Commissioners' scale and Report there are in the diocese of Ely, 47 benefices requiring an increase on the whole of 4020*l.* per annum; (our estimate was something different, as they have not clearly expressed the data on which they proceeded, yet sufficiently near, 3867*l.*); of this they proposed to augment, *in the first place*, what was in public *patronage*, 2819*l.* per annum: Lord Harrowby, where ecclesiastics are impropriators; this would amount to 2465*l.* per annum: viz. in colleges, 878*l.*, chapters, 1107*l.*,† bishop, 480*l.*, leaving 964*l.* to lay impropriations, and but 438*l.* where there are no impropriations at all. Now the reservation of 2465*l.* annual income, on the expiration of the present leases, mostly at the term of 14—21 years, would cost annually but 528*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.*; in the case of lives, the cost would be less, the benefit more remote. Thus then nearly the whole benefit, which the Commissioners contemplate, might be obtained at a sacrifice of 528*l.* 4*s.* 4*d.*, which, spread over these several

\* "When questions are raised about continuing the service for King Charles the Martyr, I answer, by pointing to the case of 'the sinners, the Amalekites,' who were judged at the distance of 500 years,"—*Froude's Remains*, vol. i. p. 432.

† Barnwell, or St. Andrew the Less, a donative containing 6909, with an income of 48*l.*, has been accounted as a part of St. Andrew the Greater, of which the dean and chapter of Ely are impropriators.

sources, would not be hurtfully felt; nearly the whole sum which they calculated upon from the confiscation of four stalls, and the separate estates of Ely, 2824*l.*, might be obtained, and the stalls might remain for such diocesan purposes as might be required. But then we are justified in expecting that this would not be all the benefit; among the lay impropriations there is one which, on the Commissioners' scale, would receive 80*l.*, held now in plurality, of which a noble duke, whose ancestry shared largely in Church-property, is impropriator and patron: another, with a population of 4000, would receive 78*l.*; another, above 2000, 238*l.*, in both of which the same earl is impropriator; a fourth, with a population of 588, receives but 88*l.*, another earl being the impropriator. We feel convinced that these, and many others, would not be allowed so to continue, if the thoughts of the lay impropriators were earnestly called to their responsibility, and the example set by the ecclesiastics.

To take a more extensive case, the largest of all, the diocese of York. This, according to the Commissioners, would require 45,356*l.*, of which 23,891*l.* is in public patronage. Our calculations have fallen somewhat short of this, 44,163*l.* Yet this will suffice to show the proportions. Of this sum then, 16,856*l.* would be bestowed upon livings, in which the impropriations belong to that class, which the Commissioners call "public:" viz. the Crown, 3209*l.*; the archbishop of York, 2549*l.*; other bishops, 250*l.*; chapters, 5950*l.*; colleges, 2454*l.*; hospitals and schools, 2444*l.* This, according to the above ratio, would, on Lord Harrowby's plan, or the Archbishop's Act, require a deduction from their joint revenues of 3612*l.* per annum; *i.e.* 3612*l.* per annum in the one way, would go as far as 16,856*l.* in the other, or would procure it. Further, of the sums thus required for the remaining livings, 4675*l.* per annum is for livings of which peers, and, in many cases, very wealthy and well-disposed peers, are the impropriators; 14,844*l.* is, where other laymen are impropriators; and 7772*l.* only, where we have not ascertained that there is any impropriation; *i.e.* little more than one-sixth of the whole sum is wanting on account of the real poverty of the Church, and, of the remaining deficiency, 22,729*l.* is owing to spoliation, the tithes being in the hands of the crown or of laymen.

To take the other most crying case, the diocese of Chester. For it, 41,854*l.* would be required according to the principles of the Report; 25,868*l.* for livings in private patronage; 15,986*l.* for those to be first augmented, those in public patronage. The application of *impropriations* belonging to the same class would yield nearly the same sum, 12,312*l.*; the crown, 2976*l.*, bishops,

2518*l.*, colleges, 2850*l.*, chapters,\* 3968*l.*; whereof the Church portion, 9356*l.* per annum, might, as above, be obtained by a sacrifice of 2005*l.* per annum. The remainder, as far as we have ascertained it, consists of 3,853*l.* impropriations of peers; 8993*l.* other lay people, and 12,591*l.* not accounted for. This is not given as adequate information; it is felt to be inadequate; it would be to do what has been imputed as an error to the Commissioners, to rely solely or mainly upon the Ecclesiastical Revenue Returns. The number of perpetual curacies very much increases the difficulty; in that they have been taken out of some rectory, but without local knowledge it would often not appear to what they belonged.

The two cases of York and Chester have been purposely selected, as being the most unfavourable; it is the uniform answer of such as advocate the fusing of church property into one common fund, "what is otherwise to be done for the great towns of Cheshire, Lancashire, or Yorkshire?" and it appears thus far, that upon Lord Harrowby's plan nearly as much might be done, without destroying a single stall (and leaving, therefore, a proportion of stalls to be employed in judicious annexation),† as by that sketched by the Commissioners. But neither have we thus at all exhausted the resources of the act 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45, for this extends not only to cases of impropriations, but where ecclesiastics, having property of any sort, have the patronage also. This, then, bishops have acted upon, and upon true church principles; we deprecate exceedingly any interference with their incomes; their property has been confided to them, to deal with it according to their judgment, and no earthly power has any right to step in and control it; they are the stewards of God. Still, however circumstances have since changed, they were originally the treasurers of the Church's property, to apportion it as they pleased; the liberality of our early forefathers gave them an ample income, while yet the inferior clergy of their dioceses "had no lack." The sacrilege committed at the Reformation has sadly changed the condition of these latter; and therefore, if any of

\* Manchester has here been omitted, as being a case per se; the Collegiate Church is impropriator, and so responsible as far as its means will go.

† We have not entered upon the subject of annexation, because Lord John Russell (see above) proposes to annex almost all the remaining stalls (thus making the stall a parochial commendam); yet a great deal of good might be legitimately done, not by subdividing canonries but by requiring them to keep an efficient body of curates. Thus Leeds had a population of 123,393, Church-room for 12,243, one-tenth, unprovided for 86,654. Income (including vicarage £1257) £4010 among 14 clergy and the assistant curates of the vicar. For this the (unproductive) impropriation belonging to Christ Church, Oxford, would not suffice; but annexation might be resorted to. So also most of the Cathedral towns have large ill-endowed cures, as Ely, Exeter, Rochester (Chatham, 18,000, church-room for 3,600) &c.

them have (as the Commission assumes) more than they need, it were in entire conformity with the practice of the Church for them to part with some of their funds, and send out fresh clergy into such parts of their dioceses as are not provided for. We deprecate, again, expressing any opinion as to the incomes of the Archbishops, or of the Bishops of London and Durham; but this we say, that if it pleases these most reverend fathers to part with any portion of their income, in order to send forth fresh shepherds to seek after their Master's scattered sheep, it is a godly and acceptable act to the Great Shepherd, of whose sheep they have the charge; but it is contrary to every principle of church polity, that their property should be taken from their see by any human power; it is contrary to the first principles of justice, that it should be taken, while the vineyard of their own diocese lies waste, because they are to be deprived of that wherewith to hire labourers to dress it and to keep it.

Thus, to give instances, the sum needed, according to the Commissioners' scale, for livings of which the see of York is impropriator, is 2374*l.* per annum; on the scale of their real wants it would be far higher; one of these places, of which the see is impropriator and patron, is the important town of Doncaster, its population at the last census was 11,572, its vicar has 125*l.* per annum; a perpetual curacy (founded, it seems, by private bounty,) yields the only assistance; and 11,572 persons were committed, at most, to two clergy, when on an efficient system there ought to have been eleven. The *mere* raising such an endowment to 400*l.* per annum, as the Commissioners propose, would do little or no good; we need not only larger stipends, but an enlarged body of clergy; the *mere* raising of stipends might diminish the discomforts of the clergy, but would leave the large masses of our population as heathen as before. To take a case of the other sort, the archbishop is patron of Silkstone vicarage, and the Barnsleys, in Silkstone, perpetual curacies (the rectory appears to be lost); according to the Report, the aggregate population was 14,682; having churches containing 3170, and four clergymen, with an average of 155*l.* per annum. The Commissioners' scale would allot them 580*l.* in addition; but what are four clergy, or church-room for 3170, among 14,682 souls? We instance this, not as one of the heavier cases, but as one which would naturally look to the archbishop for relief (if relief, according to the plan of the Commission, is to be given), and which would be injured by the abstraction of any property of the see, to eke out the loss of "commendams *without* cure of souls." Alas! it would be easy to multiply cases in which the diocese would have a prior claim upon the episcopal bounty, over any distinct see; but it is not for us

to seem to parcel out the property of the see; what has been said is enough to illustrate the injustice of taking away any portion of it for other dioceses.

Again, to instance the other archiepiscopal see: if certain perpetual curacies are excluded, the sum to be added (on the Commissioners' scale) to the *livings* of which the see is impropriator (we believe 1203*l.* per annum), very little exceeds that which the present archbishop has already annexed in reversion, 1090*l.*; but this is the very least portion of what is required for the efficient cure even of those places. It is what are called valuable livings which are often in most need. Thus, in the diocese of Chester, his grace is the patron and impropriator of two important and well-endowed livings, Rochdale 1730*l.*, and Blackburn 893*l.*; yet these two livings, with the perpetual curacies belonging to them, and in the nomination of the vicar, contained, at the last census, Rochdale 76,174, Blackburn 58,231 souls. These, in Blackburn, are (exclusive of the mother Church, which contains 2200) distributed, as far as they can be said to be distributed, among the chapelries or perpetual curacies, with church-room for 12,375 (one-fourth), and stipends, rising from 34*l.*, 43*l.*, 67*l.*, to 156*l.*, in all 1431*l.* In Rochdale, the chief parish comprises 34,277, its churches at most 2093; the whole district has, besides the mother Church, eight churches or chapels, with stipends rising from 67*l.* to 256*l.*, in all 1147*l.* The entire proportion, or rather disproportion, of church-room, is one-tenth; so that if we take the average of one-third as the standard, there are 53,818 persons destitute of the means of grace. To add a third case in the same diocese: the see of Canterbury is the patron of Whalley, and most of the perpetual curacies in the district belonging to it, are in the nomination of the vicar; the see is stated to be the impropriator of one district; a nobleman, of Whalley itself. Of course the see can be no further responsible, in this case, than for its own impropriation; yet, when arrangements are being made for parting with the revenues of the see, certainly the perpetual curacies of Whalley, which were confided to its cure, are more natural objects of her fostering care than the episcopal fund. The whole district of Whalley contained 85,768 souls; that portion more immediately under the see, as belonging to, or being in the nomination of its vicar, 55,729, in ten districts, with church-room for one-sixth, 9009; accordingly 28,700 are left to Heathenism.

No one can imagine that any of this is said in blame either of the present or former metropolitans; impropriations often become, from change of circumstances, of little value; nor can strangers know any thing of the circumstances; his grace has

conferred a good deed upon the Church, for which she will have reason to value his memory, in resuming what our ancient bishops strove to do, but which, since the Revolution, till now, had been neglected, the improvement of poor vicarages by means of impropriations. The above instances have only been given to illustrate the superiority of the plan of Sir Robert Peel's over this later commission, and that it is best for each foundation to take care of its own, not to confound all in a common fund. These are the strongest cases with regard to the archiepiscopal property; they are the wants of nearly 200,000 souls; and it is impossible to doubt, that far more good would be done by the single example of these 200,000 being adequately provided for by him, whom the very law terms their patron, a greater stimulus be given to other Christian exertion, than by any purpose to which the fund could apply it. To name one more case: these numbers give an inadequate notion to persons unfamiliar with the place where they are collected: Ramsgate is close at hand; yet few ever have seen its single church, presiding, nobly as it does, over the town, and not have felt that one large church, chiefly occupied by the rich, with a chapel, was utterly inadequate for that population, which spreads on all sides beneath it; no one could think that three clergymen were sufficient for it; it also is an impropriation of the see of Canterbury; its income just reaches the highest level of the Commission, 400*l.*, and from it would have no aid. Blackburn is more than eight, Whalley more than ten, Rochdale about seven Ramsgates.

It is not necessary to illustrate the cases of other dioceses with the same detail; it may suffice briefly to state, that of the contributing bishoprics, Ely (whose average income is now rated at 8000*l.* instead of 1100*l.*) derives a part of its income from vicarages, which, on the Commissioners' scale, would require an increase of 1255*l.* per annum, and this is obviously the minimum not the maximum, and of these, three might well employ two clergymen; yet it were idle to suppose that when the wants of Cheshire and Lancashire are prominent in men's minds, as *the* object to be attended to, they will pay due regard to populations of 300 or 400. Again, a parish of 130 or 155 (such are some of those of which the bishop holds the impropriations) would have a claim which would be felt by a bishop in dispensing *his* income; but they would obviously be lost in a board accustomed to the contemplation of thousands. Yet, though comparatively of less apparent account, they are obviously to be considered *absolutely*, in the first instance, without any reference to any others, *because* it is their property. But this is not in human nature; their claims would come to be looked at suspiciously as preventing a greater good; they would



be pared down, if regarded at all; or two or more thrown into one, or got rid of somehow. No one can think that when the fund, if ever obtained, came to be applied, the Commissioners would ever examine the impropriations of the see of Ely, which might have been augmented, had not the 2500*l.* per annum been abstracted from it. The utmost that they would do, would be to look at the places whence the confiscated fund is to arise; and even this grudgingly, as interfering with a greater object. Injustice then will be done in this way to Ely.

This need not be repeated again and again; if the bishops think their incomes larger than they need, their dioceses are the natural recipients of their bounty, and there, unhappily, is not a diocese in England which might not most thankfully receive any overflowings of their goodness. The bishops can, at present, benefit to most advantage the spots where their impropriations or their estates lie, but if these will not exhaust their store, it were better far that they should have a fresh enabling act, whereby they might pour back into some other portion of their diocese, whatever it pleases them to bestow, than to transfer it to a general extra-diocesan fund.

Further, although the dioceses should receive back out of the common fund the same bounty which they would from their bishop, the plan of a common fund would evidently be objectionable, not only as wasteful and insecure, and at best circuitous, but because, first, it would do it at disadvantage, in the ratio of seven to one and a half; secondly, the bishop, not a fund, is the natural benefactor of his clergy. The gift of the bishop is affectionate and attaching; that of the fund, dispensing the resources of others, mere matter of pounds, shillings and pence.

There is one more diocese, however, which is the more worth considering, because upon it turns the whole plan. If Durham retain any large portion of its property, the general fund is at an end; for the chapter of Durham alone is to yield one-fourth of the whole chapter, the bishopric one-third of the episcopal, fund. We are here mainly concerned with the latter, but both turn upon the same principle; and there lies an *à priori* suspicion of bias (which one of the lay Commissioners honestly admitted)\* in their decision as to the claims of the diocese to be considered apart.

\* "Surely this House ought in justice to introduce such a clause or instruction to the Committee as will save some portion of this 40,000*l.*, which, it seems, is to be taken away without any explanation whatever, *except*, indeed, it be that the whole amount is grasped because it is the easiest to lay hold of, as a noble earl, one of the Commissioners, said to me, 'Oh! Durham is the great nest-egg: if we do not pounce upon that, we can do nothing at all.' My lords, I do protest against this wholesale dealing."—(Marquis of Londonderry on Durham Eccl. Revenues, July 21, 1836, *Mirr. of Parl.* 2473.)

To take then two places only, in which the bishop has property, and therefore, as frequently explained, could aid them to great advantage, Gateshead and Sunderland, neither have any other resource.

So long then as Gateshead and Sunderland remain as orphan children cast upon his care and tutelage, with no adequate provision,\* with a population of about 30,000, and church-room for one-tenth, and destitution for seven-tenths, even above 20,000 souls, we think it, we must speak, a sinful thing to take away the children's bread, and to give to others. Again, if the bishop of Durham ought to help his poorer brethren among the bishops, he might aid them, and the children of the see at the same time, by relieving his brother of Carlisle, (who, with the dean and chapter, is the impropiator of Newcastle,) of the responsibility attending its destitution. Newcastle, with a population of about 60,000, has church-room again for about one-tenth, only that the destitute, seven-tenths, are in this case twice as many, above 40,000.† We cannot but think, if something of this kind was attempted, a similar spirit might be kindled in noble dukes, who are well able, and, we trust, willing to spare a portion at least of what once was given to the Church; and that Alnwick, Earsden, and Tynemouth, (portions of whose impropriate tithes are held by one duke,) would not, with populations severally of 6788, 6757, and 26,707, be left with church-room for 1150, 200,‡ and 2000, and their ministers with incomes of 175*l.*, 119*l.*, 298*l.*, i. e., that one-twelfth only of the whole number should have a place wherein to worship God, 30,000 be left destitute. Nor are these by any means all the cases of *great* emergency; there would still remain,

	Pop.	Room.	Income.	Clergy.	Imp.
Monk-Wearmouth	9428	1000	225	1	lay.
Chester-le-Street§	10,493	1000	377	3	lay.
Darlington . . .	9419	1200	274	2	another duke.

again, by a sort of miserable uniformity, one-tenth provided for, and 20,000 deprived of their birth-right. We have no reason

\* Gateshead and Sunderland are both rectories; Gateshead with 636*l.* per annum, (distinct from Gateshead-fell, population 3339, church 1000, income 172*l.*,) Sunderland altogether 386*l.*, whereas they require thirty clergy.

† Since the above was in type, we see in the statistic account, quoted p. 551, in Newcastle, "a new Church built, but not endowed."

‡ So in the Ecclesiastical Revenues Report; one should have wished to hope it was a misprint for 2000, which would have been near the right proportion.

§ Exclusive of Tanfield, population 2500, church-room 700, income 133*l.*, impropiator and patron a peer.

to think that the present noble possessors of a portion of these tithes, even know that they possess them, or the moral misery caused by their holding or withholding them; but should they be unwilling to help in the good work (which we have no knowledge of, either way) we had rather see the Church take it wholly upon herself, and re-place from what remains what was taken from her, than leave such cases of destitution.

In addition to these, in one only of which there is any ecclesiastical impropriation, are the following places with large populations, of which the dean and chapter of Durham are impropriators.

	Population.	Church.	Income.	Clergy.
Berwick . . . . .	8920	1000	£353	1
South Shields in Jarrow	11407	2000	330	1
Tweedmouth . . . .	4971	200	144	1
Westoe in Jarrow . .	9680	1300	222	1
Jarrow with . . . }	3598	355	197	2
Heworth . . . }	5424	1100		
	<hr/> 44,000	<hr/> 5955	<hr/> 1246	<hr/> 6

The poverty of income we know that the dean and chapter have amended, as far as is allowed them, although by the terms of the act 1 & 2 Will. IV. we see not how in these cases it could exceed 50*l.* per annum; we know also that they contemplated to build and endow a second church at Berwick;\* but the lack of church-room and of ministers could not be so readily supplied; again, we have but between one-seventh and one-eighth provided for, and 28,135 destitute; we have (so at least the returns give) six clergy to minister among 44,000,—six, where there ought to be forty-four.

There are other cases requiring help, although less strong than these, as—

	Population.	Church.	Income.
Falstone R. . . . .	4561	600	£219
Stockton-upon-Tees† .	7991	1500	247 lay imp.
Newburn . . . . .	4639	600	230 Bp. of Carlisle.

where between one-sixth and one-seventh are provided for, and the destitute but 9000.

And now, to sum up these miserable items of deficiency, in *nine*

\* Archdeacon Thorp's Charge, p. 6.

† The Bishop of Durham, though not impropriator, would, on the ground of patronage or property, be enabled by the act 1 & 2 Will. IV. c. 45, to augment Stockton, Newburn, and Alnwick, out of the leased property of the see. See a valuable statistic account given by the Marquis of Londonderry on occasion of his motion on the Durham Ecclesiastical Revenues, July 21, 1836.—*Mirr. of Parl.* 2469.

towns in the single diocese of Durham there are 110,000,—in *nine* more (four of them in the one district of Jarrow) there are above 37,000,—in all, there are by this time far above 150,000, virtually excommunicated by the Church without any fault of theirs. No wonder then that Satan seized many, whom the Church has neglected to inclose within the fold, so that a judge\* pronounced—

“ This county, though comparatively small, presents a larger display of atrocious crimes than the calendar of the Central Court of Middlesex has exhibited during the last twelve months. It is clear that religion and morality have not spoken to the hearts of so many offenders.”

To be measured with the metropolis, with its armies of thieves and its abodes of sin, and yet to be adjudged worse than it! We cannot think that the Commissioners could have realized this, when they recommended that 39,686*l.* of the revenues of Durham should be removed from the diocese, above one-half its episcopal revenues be taken away, with the vague promise of first “ considering the places whence the revenue was derived.” We cannot think, with these appalling facts really present to their minds, they could have ventured upon such an act of injustice, as to recommend that the property which Durham needed, should be taken from her, that the wealth which accrued from her collieries should be taken to supply other places, and they, whose strength is expended to obtain it, be left unsupplied. And yet no one can think that were this sum “ abstracted ” from her, any fair proportion would be returned, or her children provided for by strangers as by their natural parents. One cannot doubt that comparisons would come in ; and yet, since the funds come from Durham, any thing short of what would be allotted to her, if there were no wants in the whole of England but her’s, would be unjust ; it would be to withhold from her, her own. It is not for us to advise men, liberal as the chapter of Durham ; but the monks in the West of England, who, when they dreaded Henry’s grasp, erected monuments to themselves in the beautiful towers, which they added to their churches, and so in some measure eluded the spoiler, gave a worthy example to follow. They put some of their property, at least, in safe keeping, and are remembered with gratitude.

This plan of spoliation is unwise, as well as cruel and unjust. Let but an example be set, of providing such a population as that of the diocese of Durham adequately with ministers, and we might look to see such a mighty spirit of emulation stirred in our

\* Quoted by Mr. Lambton, in his motion in behalf of the See of Durham, in the Committee on the Established Church Bill, July 12, 1836,—*Mirr. of Parl.* 2349.

whole land, as should give a new spring and life to our whole Christian existence; scatter it, and you will sow your land with salt, dry up the springs of Christian charity, or give them a bitter taste. Like begets like; let the diocese of Durham be furnished with pastors on a noble scale, and others will "see the good work and glorify our Father which is in heaven;" let its property be parcelled out among the towns of England whose it is not, and which ought to be supplied by other means, and they will be apt scholars in learning the trade of beggary; will wait for their vineyard to be tilled by the labour of others, until it bring forth again its thorns and briers. To pull down an ancient consecrated building, is to lay but an ill foundation of that we would raise. *Diruit, ædificat*, was a very proverb for instability. "Every wise woman buildeth her house, but the foolish plucketh it down with her hands." We cannot conceive a plan better devised to stifle the noble spirit which is now beginning to rise among us, than to heap upon it this fuel, which is not its own. Rather let it find vent in its own way, and it will burn up more steadily and more brightly. It ought to be a first principle in any arrangement that may be made, that the foundations of every place should provide for its own wants,\* Durham for Durham; London for London. If we guarantee to those places, which have foundations, their property uninjured, others will spring up; it was thus that these foundations themselves arose: by a holy emulation, not by plundering one another. It was through keeping faithfully, as a sacred deposit, that which was committed to them, that they received more; others saw the institutions flourish, and longed to be authors of the like; and so they increased and filled the land, and were the salt of the earth.

The highest act of faith were the ancient way of giving unto the treasury of the bishop for him to dispense to his diocese; but this was not required; every one has his own way of viewing and doing things; one would found schools, another colleges, another hospitals, a fourth a monastery, a fifth a parochial church; one would leave the fellowship, which he founded, for the whole of England, another wished to secure a benefit for his native county or the grammar-school at which he had himself been instructed: and thus, while each followed his own natural bent, some, it may be, with more expansive views than others, others

\* "It is an imbecile way in order to found a See at Manchester, to take from the revenues of bishoprics. No; let men go and preach in the streets of Manchester: they would be pelted. Never mind; in time, persons would attend to them, and rich people would leave their money, first one, and then another. Every place should support its own church."—*Froude's Remains*, v. 1, p. 434. As it is, the "pelting," by all accounts, seems likely enough to happen; but without the honour of founding a bishopric.

again with a more affectionate and simple gratitude to the spot which God had made the channel of His goodness to them. The wants of all were ministered to by that which each supplied; some it may be more richly than others; but the richer were no injury to the poorer, nor did the poorer envy the richer, but rather "the whole body fitly joined together by that which every joint supplied, according to the effectual working of every part, made increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love."

This it has been the wisdom of the Church, and a righteous act on her part, to retain: it may be that *we* might think some of the gifts might have been more judiciously disposed; yet she felt a noble confidence that things would in the end work best, if allowed to work according to the measure of insight which God had given to those whose hearts He had stirred: and obviously the common wants would thus be supplied more completely than if one mind were set up as the measure of all. The contributions for the building of the tabernacle\* furnish a striking type for the variety of Christian service;—

"And they came, every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whom his spirit made willing, and they brought the Lord's offering to the work of the tabernacle of the congregation, and for all his service, and for the holy garments. And they came, both men and women, as many as were willing-hearted, and brought bracelets, and earrings, and rings, and tablets, all jewels of gold: and every man that offered, offered an offering of gold unto the Lord. And every man, with whom was found blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, and red skins of rams, and badgers' skins, brought them. Every one that did offer an offering of silver and brass brought the Lord's offering: and every man, with whom was found shittim wood for any work of the service, brought it. And all the women that were wise hearted did spin with their hands, and brought that which they had spun, both of blue, and of purple, and of scarlet, and of fine linen. And all the women whose heart stirred them up in wisdom spun goats' hair. And the rulers brought onyx stones, and stones to be set, for the ephod, and for the breastplate; and spice, and oil for the light, and for the anointing oil, and for the sweet incense."

Yet all, from the goats' hair which the women spun to the precious stones which were set in the breastplate of the high-priest, had their place and were accepted. And so the offerings of our forefathers. Their offerings were more valuable the one than the other; but he who brought the lesser, brought what would have still been missed, and which by others might have been overlooked, and by all God was glorified, and all are entered in His book.

\* Exodus, xxxv. 21—28.

We, certainly,—to judge from the way in which people speak, or in which we act,—should not have endowed Winwick with her large lands, which their piety bestowed; and we should think it an extravagance of service to inclose some little spot, containing but 112 souls, and to give it its own peculiar pastor; but they learnt of Him, who bestows his gifts with a rich (so to speak) prodigality of beneficence, pouring them out on all sides, decking with glorious profusion the deep-hidden valley, or mountain recess, “where mortal foot hath ne’er or rarely been,” and not regarding though they be, as it seems to us, lost or excessive. And such as they gave them, it were our faithfulness and wisdom to retain them; so, if we be faithful to our stewardship, shall we be entrusted with that which is now lacking to us.

The Commissioners say,\*

“It is to be hoped that the sacrifices which will be required from the cathedral and collegiate churches of the country, will have the effect of stimulating individual benevolence to contribute towards the accomplishment of these most important ends.”

But they have confounded two very different things. “Sacrifices made *by* the cathedral and collegiate churches,” such as those which Durham has made and is making, *will* and have had the effect of stimulating individual benevolence, their self-denying contributions towards the spiritual benefit of others, will excite others to “follow their good example;” sacrifice of self will teach others sacrifice of self; “but sacrifices made *of* the cathedral and collegiate churches,” sacrifices made by those to whom it costs nothing, are neither acceptable to God, nor will they teach man any thing, but to do the like, i. e. make sacrifices, not of his own, but of others. When the cathedral and collegiate churches have thus been “sacrificed,” people will look out for some fresh victim to offer upon the altar of their own indolence, but they will never learn in this way, to make unto God the acceptable sacrifice of themselves, or to “offer to Him of His own.” Already they have begun. The tallest flowers in our garden, the remnant of days in which it was more duly cultivated, have had their heads struck off; the next have been marked out to be mown down; and so they will follow on still, faithfully executing the precept of the Roman king, ever mowing off the highest which remains, until all be one waste. From the Archbishoprics or the Bishoprics of Ely or Durham, they were led on to the cathedrals; and now they go on where those, who have led them thus far, would fain have stopped them, and talk of the “waste” of income upon Winwick, or Stanhope, or Doddington.† And if *their* incomes were dispersed,

\* Report II, p. 8.

† See Speeches in the House of Commons quoted above.

then to the next class below them; and so on, until they should bring down all the munificence of our ancestors to one low level, nor leave one favoured spot amid their wilderness. It is too plain that, besides the supposed benefits of the property to be obtained from the cathedrals, some of the Commissioners thought it an advantage to be freed from the odium of their wealth; they thought probably that they should obtain readier contributions, if this wealth were more evenly distributed, that if this store were dissipated, others would be found to bring fresh supplies more liberally; they thought it a positive good to be rid of the cathedrals, and would say, "now there is not this disproportionate wealth, we have done what we could, now come and help us." They wholly miscalculated human nature, and have admitted a mischievous principle against themselves; they have not effaced, they have scarcely diminished, the inequality. While livings vary from below 10*l.* to 7306*l.* (Doddington), or while people can say that a Dean of Durham is left worth ten times a Dean of Chester,\* or can refer to the 15,000*l.* per annum "assigned to the Archbishop of Canterbury," nothing is done towards it; the "love of money" is to be cured not by giving "money," but by correcting the "love;" this desire of obtaining necessary aid by means which shall "cost them nothing," not by sacrificing the cathedrals, but by bidding them to go and do likewise, or by sacrificing ourselves.

Extreme parties often render good service by exhibiting the tendencies of things which in the less consistent remain undeveloped; they are consistent even if it be in evil, and so track out for us beforehand whither our path would lead us. There is no difference of principle, as Mr. Buxton well pointed out, between the dismembering the cathedrals and reducing the wealthy livings; make up but the patronage to the individuals, (as was proposed towards the crown and done towards the bishops,) and the thing is settled;† augment six or twelve "poor and populous parishes"

\* "The assignment of these unequal incomes (the new arrangement of the Commission) is equivalent to saying that a Dean of Durham is worth ten Deans of Chester and a Canon of Durham is worth a dozen Canons of Chester in these reforming times, and all for no other reason, which I can devise, than that in earlier times a Dean of Durham was worth twenty Deans of Chester, and so on in proportion."—*Mr. F. Buxton, 1836, Mirror of Parliament, 2288.* Undoubtedly this was the reason, and it was a sufficient reason that the founder of Durham had bestowed twenty times as much on Durham as he of Chester on Chester; but by remodelling the incomes at all, they cut away the ground from under their feet.

† A plan of this kind has actually been devised by a well-meaning Clergyman (who talks very quietly of "the Cathedral Fund.") "A few Suggestions for increasing the Incomes of many of the smaller Livings, for the almost total Abolition of Pluralities, and for promoting the residence of Ministers in the several Parishes, more particularly addressed to the Members of both Houses of Parliament." He fell into the usual error of regarding patronage as the only point to be considered, instead of the right of the several places to the incomes accruing from them.



with the surplus of Doddington, and half the number with that of Winwick, and give the "patronage" to their patrons; and on *this* scheme, they are unreasonable if they refuse it, and should be compelled; on the profit and loss scheme the livings would even be more marketable commodities than before.

The question then, now about to be decided, is not simply (momentous as that is) about the cathedral churches; it is not between the deans and chapters and the Commission; we may hope that the miserable necessity of remonstrance, and opposition to a body, in which some of our bishops had consented to take a part, is at an end; their schemes have passed into other hands, and are already receiving a development, which they did not contemplate. Both the Plurality and anti-Cathedral bills are lay bills. The question is about the "WHOLE TENURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF CHURCH PROPERTY AND THE WHOLE LEGISLATIVE FOR THE CHURCH. It is whether the Church is ever hereafter to legislate for herself, either in synod or convocation, or to have her services, her ordinances, and her creeds,\* at the disposal of the state; whether she is to retain her liberty which Christ confided to her, or to be "in bondage with her children" to those who are not of her. It is, again, whether we are to be allowed, by sacrificing of our own, to establish a memorial for ever to our Maker's praise, or whether whatever has been dedicated to His service, becomes public property, the property of man and of the state, to deal with as it pleases; it is whether the earth and the Church are man's or God's. It is assumed, as a first principle, in this re-distribution of the Church's property at the hands of the state, that property is a creature of the state, that it so belongs to the state as that its present possessors have no right to alienate it from it, and dedicate it to God; that the state not only protects us in its possession, but that we hold it of it, and not of God. It steps in between us and our Maker, and says, "You shall not employ it to such and such ends, you shall put nothing out of my control; I am sovereign dispenser, and who is Lord over me?" Both these things are involved in principle; if the state may scatter the property which our northern ancestors, in the diocese of Durham, dedicated to God's service in their own homes, and may portion it out in Cheshire or Lancashire, then the remainder is matter of time only; it is the first letting out of water, and it will continue to flow, as it may be, more or less rapidly, until all have passed

\* "If you mean to conciliate that portion of the Dissenters, who have always shown the sincerest attention to the Church, you must revise your Liturgy and your Articles. Why can you not remove from it those things which are so much objected to, for instance, the Athanasian Creed, the Communion, and other things."—*Mr. Peulter on 2nd Reading of Established Church Bill, 1835. Mirr. of Parl. 2379.*

out of our possession, into the new receptacle which the state has made for it. There will be no further question of principle; it will be matter of detail only and of expediency. Either all is secured, because it has been dedicated for ever by those who were entrusted with it and with the power of disposing of it, or none; either it is to be retained for the uses for which they gave it, or if the state may alter the application in the one case, it may in another. It may just as well appropriate the revenues of Durham for some scheme of national education, as for providing or eking out the salaries of ministers in Lancashire or Cheshire; and in time it *will*. Again, if the state may prescribe to us what number of sermons we shall preach to our flocks, and set a lay-commission over our bishops, it may prescribe any thing else,—at least to such portion of the Church as shall retain any connection with it, and may be their bishop.

We firmly trust, however, that, like all similar attempts of late, this too will rather end in the strengthening of the Church, in clearing men's views as to her nature and office, and the means of benefitting her; and so what is evil in these bills will rather turn to her good. The very struggle about the preservation of the cathedrals has had its use; the body of cathedral clergy have been called to re-examine the nature of their institutions,\* their duties, and responsibilities, and the means of fulfilling them. While impressing upon others the importance of their office in the Church, they have probably deepened their own consciousness of it; they have professed themselves ready to make sacrifices, and when the time comes, will make them.

The way of a mixed Commission has been tried, and satisfied none. Let the bishops resume their consultations as a body, either privately as they were wont, or more formally in synod, and the clergy will place full confidence in them. The change in the disposition of the funds of the Church has failed, and well-nigh shaken the security of all the property of the Church; let them try what the mere putting in force existing responsibilities will do. Let our bishops resume their plan of giving back their impropriations (we say not, as some of them did, "in whole," but) in such part as is needed, to the poor or populous parishes which shall need them: this voluntary bounty of theirs, *which they have held out to the clergy*, will be received with affectionate gratitude by them, and bind them the more to their considerate diocesans. It will not be the gift only, but the gift as coming from the giver,

\* We are glad here to name a few pages, which have just reached us, "Suggestions arising out of the proposed Alterations in the Cathedral Establishments of England and Wales." By C. A. Moysey, D.D., Archdeacon of Bath.

which will be prized ; and it will augment also the virtual resources of the Church. Then, when they have digested this plan among themselves, let them consult, in mutual confidence, with the several chapters, or other ecclesiastical bodies or individuals possessing impropriations, and examine in detail what and how much may be done for the Church generally, through the places with which they are connected. We are convinced, upon examination, that far more may be done in this way, and that without injury to the chapters, than would at first sight appear. For we hold the responsibility of the chapters to extend, not simply to places whereof they have the patronage, but to all of which they have the impropriations, and in these, not merely to provide *one* minister with his income proportionate to his labours or the importance of his office, but with such number of ministers as may be necessary.

They received the tithes on the express condition of providing for the spiritual instruction of the place, and if this could not be effected without the sacrifice of the whole amount of any given portion of tithes, they must (as in some cases has been done by chapters) be sacrificed. (We put this as an extreme case, though by the wise provisions of the Archbishop's Act ; it would seldom prove necessary). Thus, to revert again to the diocese of Chester, the Cathedral of Christ Church is obviously responsible for the whole townships of Budworth, 15,955 ; Runcorn, 10,326 ; Frodsham, 5547 ; Rostherne, 3730 ; Knutsford, 3326 ; Kirkham, 11,640 ; as the see of Canterbury for Blackburn, 59,791 ; and Rochdale, 34,277 ; Trinity College, Cambridge, for Kendal, 17,427 ; King's College for Prescott, 28,084 ; for Manchester, 270,961, as far as it could extend its Collegiate Church. If this were done, the benefits conferred on the immediate places would be the least portion of the good resulting. What is felt to be now every where wanting, is a sufficient stimulus to great exertion ; we are just waking (all alike, it is not one class only) from the torpor which seemed to press upon the whole of the 18th century ; ordinary means will not suffice ; our exertions, on which we congratulate ourselves, do not by any means keep pace even with the increase of our wants ; we are losing ground, year by year : yet there is an awakening desire to do something to enlarge the efficiency of our Church, and extend her fostering care to all her children. What we want then is something to direct this, and give it a bolder essay and a loftier impulse, to raise the standards by which people should measure the supply of spiritual wants ; to furnish them a pattern which to copy. It is admitted by the Commissioners that even if 130,000*l.* were raised from the confiscations, it would fall miserably short of what we need ; it

would raise the incomes, for instance, of half the parishes in England which need such supply, on a graduated scale of 150*l.*, 200*l.*, 300*l.*, 400*l.*, and leave the other half where they were, and our large populations totally unsupplied, and ourselves exhausted. The funds of charity are inexhaustible.

“Where,” asks Dr. Spry,\* “is the policy of thus deluding the friends of the Church with the prospect of funds which are partly imaginary, and will be wholly inefficient, and thus checking the munificent spirit of which such noble examples are daily exhibited, and leaning upon expedients of questionable policy, and doubtful equity, when the piety and liberality of the nation, appealed to properly and duly encouraged, offers immediate and inexhaustible resources? It is impossible to doubt the effect of such an appeal, even if now made, and accompanied with a declaration that its success would save these venerable establishments from ruin, and secure an object which their ruin could not effect. Nor can it be supposed that the different chapters of England would be unwilling to devote a liberal portion of their revenues to the increase of a parochial ministry, if they were consulted on that subject by their diocesans, and duly excited by that magnificent liberality which the prelates of England on every fit occasion are so ready to display. Surely it would be well at least to try the effect of such an appeal, for was it but moderately successful, a sum would be speedily obtained far exceeding any thing which the spoliation of Cathedral and Collegiate establishments can for many years supply, and the Church would be preserved in her integrity.”

On the other hand, when the present rising feeling should be fanned into a flame, by the sacrifices of our bishops in the first instance, and then of the cathedral or collegiate bodies, and men saw what could be done, and had patterns worthy of old times set before them, the light would spread from city to city, until the blaze encircled our whole land, and penetrated every corner which was capable of receiving it; and deeds worthy of the old days of the Church would be done, and the riches now locked up would again flow freely for the good of the Church, and the days of her youth might return. The abundance of charity is not merely inexhaustible; it grows by being drained: it strengthens by exhausting exertion. The inadequacy of our endeavours dispirits and disheartens us, and makes us incapable of great things. We move stiffly and cramped for want of adequate exercise. The property of our bishoprics and cathedrals is spread over the whole of England, as it would seem for the very purpose of furnishing so many centres of Christian exertion, so many patterns each in its own neighbourhood. The 120 or 130,000*l.* would be long ere it was obtained, and when obtained would soon disappear; the good example set in providing South

\* Observations, p. 25, 26.

Shields, or Newcastle, or Rochdale, or Blackburn, with pastors would have an abundant offspring of similar deeds; it would make more available what we have,\* and would obtain for us fresh supplies.† We doubt not that very many among the richer impropiators would gladly make restitution, and for the poorer, who came lawfully by property, which to the state is unlawful, and which is a curse upon the nation, the Church might come to the state, not as suppliants, but claiming justice and re-demand of it her own; and we doubt not the righteous claim would in time be heard, where petitions for eleemosynary assistance would be disregarded.

The maintenance, then, of our cathedrals‡ is the common cause of the Church; their proposed reduction is the first step in the "reconstruction" of the Church, whereby it is to rest, not "on the apostles and prophets," but on the fiat of the state. The cathedrals are the common patrimony of all; while kept entire, they are the best earnest, that the liberality which founded them, shall, through them, again revive; they are memorials and fragments of a better part, and heralds of a brighter morrow; if destroyed, or mutilated, in that proportion will the standard of future munificence be lowered.

We have, in this statement, purposely confined ourselves to the one main principle of the *sacredness* of foundations; the arguments, from their utility or necessity, have never been answered; but we do not wish to defend them on these grounds. This would be to appeal to the judgment of man, as though, if he

\* The mother Church of our great towns is frequently well endowed; but habit occasions men to go on with their one or two curates, when they might maintain ten or twelve, and yet leave themselves a competency such as the chief minister should have. This would be broken through, if a better system were somewhere introduced, as through the bishops and cathedrals it might.

† The repeal of the Statute of Mortmain would facilitate this. Bishop Kennett (*Cases of Improvements*, p. 390, sqq.) shows that its object was to protect the rights of the crown, which now no longer exist, and its present unreasonableness. Its very meaning is now vulgarly misunderstood; it was to prevent property passing into "dead hands," i. e. such as did not contribute to the defence of the state. Improvements may be restored at present to the places whence they accrue, notwithstanding the Statute of Mortmain.

‡ It is with much satisfaction that we find that their cause is to be pleaded before the House of Lords and the Judges; and we trust, that the parochial clergy will not allow it to be stated, as it was in the alterations of the bishoprics, that "the Church" was favorable to the plan. Petitions, impressing a few strong principles, such as the inviolability of our foundations; the non-interference of Parliament, (especially as at present constituted,) except in *confirming* the acts of the Church; the revocation of the Parliamentary Commission; and the repeal of so much of the Established Church Act (6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 77) as relates to the *forcible* remodelling of the incomes of our bishops; the restoration of the Church property held by the Crown; should be sent to that House or to the Crown by all who have the stability of our Church at heart. One against the Commission is, we are glad to see, put forth by the Bath Church of England Lay Association.

thought them useful, they were to be retained, if he, on the scant measure of the present day, thought otherwise, to be destroyed. We do not take men as the arbiters; we appeal to One higher than they. The question of utility is not open; the cathedrals were useful when employed aright; they may have been useless or injurious, if misemployed by their patrons; we claim them to be retained and filled aright; we do not wish our cathedrals to be left on grounds of utilitarianism; but we claim them on grounds of eternal justice, because our forefathers founded them *for ever* to the honour and praise of God, and laid an adjuration on posterity to retain them inviolate. Such adjuration no country violated, and was held guiltless. "DEUS," says the sublime simplicity of ancient English law,

"DEUS HÆREDEM FACIT, NON HOMO."

Whoso violates the inheritance of the Church, his inheritance shall be violated. Whatever nation shall give other heirs to the institutions dedicated to ALMIGHTY GOD, shall He, in the energetic language of Israel, "give heirs to," *i. e.* "cast them out and place others in their room."

---

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

*"The Beast and his Image ;" or the Pope and the Council of Trent. With the Number, Name, and Mark of the Pope, and the Mark of his Name in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Being a Commentary upon Revelation xiii.* By Frederic Fysh, M. A., of Queen's College, Cambridge. Seeley and Burnside. 1837.

"IT is not," the preface assures us, "without much reluctance and many misgivings that the author of the following Commentary ventures to obtrude it on the notice of the Christian public. Deeply sensible of his own incompetency to the office of Commentator on the Book of Revelation, he has at times felt disposed to shrink from the task; but has been encouraged to proceed, trusting to the assistance of Him whose prerogative it is, by things which are not, to bring to nought things that are."

Now what does this mean? If Mr. Fysh speaks the truth when he professes to be deeply sensible of his own incompetency to comment on the Revelation, how comes it that he has published a great octavo of between five and six hundred pages, "being a Commentary" on that part of the Scripture? He sometimes felt disposed to shrink from doing it: he actually does it with "*much* reluctance and *many* misgivings;" but somehow or other—by some persons or some means, he has been encouraged to proceed. If he was encouraged by persons calling themselves friends, we would caution him against listening to those who must be either very incompetent advisers or very malicious hoaxers. If he means that he was encouraged by the passage of Scripture to which he has referred, there is no use in arguing with him. If he supposes, that because it is the prerogative of God to make use of things that are foolish and weak, and base and despised, it is our business to follow after those things,—that, in mere dependence on the over-ruling power of Omnipotence, we are, in spite of the reluctance and misgivings of conscience and common sense, to set about that to which we really think ourselves incompetent,—if the author means any thing like this, it may be in itself sufficient to enable the reader to judge how far he is qualified to interpret the Scriptures at all.

But this is most abundantly shown by the book itself, which consists principally of the old plan of interpretation which has within these thirty years been hashed up from Mede and Bishop Newton, with every variety of sauce and flavour; the artist commonly supposing that he had something of his own to offer, in the way of alteration or addition, which would make it worth while to reprint all the rest. But let us take one or two specimens.

"The sixth vial is to be taken both *symbolically* and *literally*. The Mahomedan empire is the symbolic Euphrates, as the Papal empire, or the Papacy, is, symbolically, the Beast, and Rome, Babylon. The Ottoman empire, the mystical Euphrates, is now drying up, and therefore the destruction

of the Papacy draweth nigh. The Pope is only to practise 'five months,' or 150 years longer; and, when Halley's comet shall have completed two more revolutions, then will come the downfall of the papacy."—p. 217.

"In the year 1987, the theme of so many prophecies, the Papacy receives its death-blow. Since the Pope was '*the eighth*' head of Rome in the year 727, the 1260 years allotted to his empire must terminate A. D. 1987. Let Roman Catholics keep in mind the figures 1—9—8—7. There is a remarkable fatality connected with these figures. Let us transpose the three figures 9—8—7, placing 7 for the first figure. We have thus two permutations, 7—8—9 and 7—9—8. Have Roman Catholics forgotten the years 1789 and 1798? Have they forgotten the vials which were poured out in those years?" p. 208.

"It is, however, remarkable, that whilst Mr. Faber makes the year 1896 a fatal year, because it is 1290 years from the year 606 [if we recollect right, among the fluctuations of Mr. Faber's system, one is, that he has abandoned this year, for which he so long contended, and taken 604. Mr. Fysh seems not to be aware, that in quoting writers of this class it is absolutely necessary to use the newest edition], we have put down the following year, viz. 1897, as a fatal year, *because* it contains the fatal figures 1—7—8—9."—p. 253.

"It is well known that רומיית *Romiith*, which is the Hebrew for *Roman*, contains the number 666: but then it is in the *feminine* gender. How then can it be the name of a *man*? Mr. Faber gives the point up in despair. He says, 'it most certainly is *not* the name of a *man*.' All agree that *Romiith* is the name of the *Beast*, considered as a *Beast* or *Kingdom*, which in Hebrew are both *feminine*. If then it is the name of the *Beast*, it *must be the name of a Man*. However difficult and inexplicable this appears, the words of Scripture are most express. '*Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the Beast; for it is the number of a Man; and his number is six hundred, threescore and six.*' We were many times tempted to give up the solution of this mystery in despair, but the words of Scripture still presented themselves, '*Let God be true, and every man a liar.*' We were also convinced, that in the solution of this enigma would be found the true answer to the question, *What is the mark of the Name of the Beast?* At length, by the blessing of God, the truth flashed upon our mind, and we saw that 'the number of *the Beast*, or the number of the name of *the Beast*, is indeed the number of a *MAN*, or the number of the name of a *MAN*. At the same time we found out the MARK OF HIS NAME."—p. 515.

Does the reader want more?

"The subject is not yet exhausted. The name of the Pope and of every Latin Bishop, may be expressed thus:

"LATINUS R. R.

OR LATINUS RECTE REVERENDUS.

"Let every Romish Bishop attend to this! His signature is 'A Right Reverend Latin' [and in right reverend Latin too], and this contains the number 666!"—p. 523.



*A Grammar of the New Testament Dialect.* By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover, U.S. London: Stewart. 1838. 12mo. pp. 238.

WE regard the popularity of the works of this writer as no matter for congratulation. The editor of the little volume before us, refers us for "evidence of the author's qualifications," to his Commentaries on the Epistles to the Hebrews and the Romans. We candidly confess, that we want other evidence of Mr. Stuart's qualifications for the business of sacred criticism, than is afforded by works which carefully inculcate the Sabellian and Pelagian heresies. In the compilation of the present work, Mr. Stuart evinces a considerable acquaintance with the labours of the recent scholars of Germany. But he should have remembered, that the merits of those eminent philologists cannot be successfully emulated by the mere affectation of systematic accuracy. His book is too elementary to be acceptable to the scholar, while it is too minute and technical for the less ambitious students whose wishes do not extend beyond the acquirement of a moderate acquaintance with the language of the New Testament.

*An Universal History, from the Creation to A. D. 1828, divided into Twenty-one Periods, at the most remarkable Epochs of the World.* By Edward Quin, M. A., of Magdalen Hall, Oxford; and Barrister at Law, of the Hon. Soc. of Lincoln's Inn. Seeley and Burnside. 1838. 12mo. pp. 367.

THIS volume is intended to accompany an "Historical Atlas," by the same author, which has been some time before the public. We know not with what success Mr. Quin has executed the former part of his task, but with the aid of the valuable labours of Kruse, he could hardly fail of producing an useful work. We can scarcely award to his present attempt any high degree of commendation. We are not so unreasonable as to expect every outline of general history to exhibit the genius of Bossuet. And elegance and correctness of style are matters of minor importance in what is at most but an index. But we cannot dispense with accuracy. A very slight knowledge of Greek might have preserved him from telling his readers that Constantine V. was "surnamed Copronymus, from his suppression of cloisters."—p. 96. And it did not require any very intimate acquaintance with the antiquities of the empire, to know that Constantine VI., who was born before his father became emperor, could *not* be "surnamed Porphyrogenitus."—p. 97.

*Answer to Mr. Robert Haldane's Strictures on the Translation of Dr. Tholuck's Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans.* By the Rev. Robert Menzies, the Translator. Edinburgh: Clark. 1838. 8vo. pp. 60.

THOUGH we regard with no little jealousy the attempts which have from time to time been made to introduce among us the principles of German theology, in the present instance we can hardly take part with Mr. Haldane. He was more profitably employed in denouncing Mr. Stuart, who is corrupting America, than in casting suspicion upon Dr. Tholuck, who is purifying Germany.

*The System of National Education in Ireland: its Principles and Practice.*

By J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., of Killermont, M. P. Cheltenham: Wight.  
1838. 12mo. pp. 172.

It is truly gratifying to find an intelligent member of the legislature diligently applying himself to the collecting of evidence on a subject so important as national education. But Mr. Colquhoun must allow us to express our regret that the force of his argument is sometimes diminished by over-statement and violence. We yield to none in our dislike to the errors of Romanism; but we cannot allow that "the system of the Roman Catholic Church, like that of the Pagan or the Hindoo, is a sheer piece of priestcraft," or that "the Popish priests occupy the position which the Etrurian priests did in Italy before the Roman republic, which their augurs continued to do through the history of Rome."—p. 70.

*An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

By Richard Treffry, jun. London: Mason. 1837. 12mo. pp. xxxix. 508.

THERE are circumstances connected with this work which we are glad to have an opportunity to notice. It is probably known to many of our readers, and it ought to be known generally, that the Wesleyan Methodists were some years ago disturbed by the persevering efforts of certain persons of great name in their society, especially the late Dr. Adam Clarke, to introduce among them dangerous notions respecting the Divine Nature of the Saviour. The persons in question, restrained by no feelings of veneration for Catholic truth, and determined boldly to exercise their right of private judgment or infallibility, persuaded themselves that the Eternal Generation of the Word is not a doctrine of the Gospel, and with the perverse activity characteristic of heresy, zealously laboured to propagate their error among those subject to their influence. They met with an able antagonist in the late Mr. Watson, then the leader of the Methodist body. But the controversy appears lately to have revived. The heretical party, encouraged by the popularity of the works of Stuart, the semi-neological Professor at Andover, U. S., have again industriously exerted themselves to diffuse their Sabellian opinions. It would seem that they have been but too successful. Mr. Treffry informs us, that "already it is triumphantly announced . . . [that] *the mass of Christians out of the Establishment deny that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Eternal Son of God!*" Although we sincerely hope with Mr. Treffry, that this "startling representation is grossly exaggerated," such language would scarcely have been used if the mischief had not widely extended. This new instance of that *constant tendency to heresy*, which has been ever remarkable in the religious communities not connected with the Church, requires no comment.

The work before us, which is written by a Methodist minister, is a defence of the Catholic doctrine against the persons who hold the errors in question. It is a very creditable performance. Every modern work on such a subject, of course provokes an invidious comparison with the labours of Pearson, Bull, and Waterland. But we are not disposed to measure Mr. Treffry by an in-

equitable standard. We could have wished that he had written on what we deem safer principles; but he has read to advantage, and has produced an useful work. We trust it may, in every sense, be successful.

*Village Lectures on the Litany, preached in the Parish Church of Stifford, Essex.*

By the Reverend William Palin, B.A., Rector. London: Parker. 1837. 12mo. pp. 156.

THIS little work is a pleasing attempt to explain the Litany to a country congregation. We could wish that the amiable author entertained more worthy notions of "the Holy Catholic Church;" but his "Lectures" are written in a gentle and unpretending manner, and seem well calculated to afford assistance in the important duty of domestic instruction.

*Connected Essays and Tracts, being a Series of Inferences, deduced chiefly from the Principles of the most celebrated Sceptics; containing, I. Observations on the Foundation of Morals in Human Nature; II. A digressive Essay upon some Metaphysical Paradoxes; III. A Treatise on the Evidences of Revelation in the Scheme of Nature. And an Appendix of two Dissertations, containing some Remarks on the Question of Materialism, and the present aspect of that Controversy; and a brief Review of Hume's Natural History of Religion; with Notes upon various incidental Subjects.* By Henry O'Connor, Esq., Barrister at Law. Dublin: Hodges and Smith; Whittaker, London. 1837. 8vo. pp. 344.

THE trenchant manner in which Mr. O'Connor handles some great names in theological literature, is a bad example to critics. But we are always so glad to find lay Christians exerting themselves against the enemies of religion, that we shall not be provoked to severity, though we freely confess we cannot approve of some of the tenets advanced in his work. As the third Essay, he tells us, is the one "to which all the other speculations of this volume are intended to be ancillary," we will extract the words in which he "declares its design." "As it must be admitted that the human species is possessed of peculiar characteristics, which constitute a natural difference between ours and every other species, so it is a proposition equally axiomatical, although less frequently regarded, that these characteristic principles of our species have the nature and force of divine laws, directing the creature to that peculiar mode of life, which the Creator designed it to pursue. Such rules of action we cannot suppose to be so repugnant and incongruous in themselves, that the slightest accordance with one of them must infer the total violation of another. This sort of confusion, which indeed never disgraced a code of human jurisprudence, does not exist through all the diversified grades of animal life, nor can a similar inconsistency be detected in the conformation of any natural production, vegetable or inert. In the fabric of the world, there is no such clashing of incompatible principles, nor jarring of contradictory intentions. The mechanism of matter, and of mental being, is consistent and harmonious. The chorus of nature joins in perfect concord; and that the existence of religious feelings in the human mind, forms no exception to the universal har-

mony, is the chief object of the present Essay to illustrate and maintain."—pp. 106, 107.

*Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical.* By the Rev. J. E. Riddle, M.A. of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford; Curate of Harrow. London. Hatchards. 1838. 8vo. pp. 343.

THESE are earnest and impressive Sermons. Mr. Riddle's good taste has preserved him from the inflation and extravagance which have of late been too frequent in volumes of a similar nature.

*Colloquies: Imaginary Conversations between a Phrenologist and the shade of Dugald Stewart.* By J. Slade, M.D., F.G.S., M.P.S.L. London. Parbury. 1838. 12mo. pp. 336.

WE have never seen the notions of the Phrenologists explained more unobjectionably than they are in this little work. But we cannot congratulate the amiable author on the success with which he has managed the imaginative part of his subject. The fiction is insipid, and the dialogue wants the qualities most indispensable in that difficult species of composition.

*The Illustrated Family Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, &c. &c.; with the Self-Interpreting and Explanatory Notes, and Marginal References of the late Rev. John Brown, Minister of the Gospel at Haddington; to which is appended a complete Concordance to the Old and New Testament.* Smith, Elder & Co. 1838.

THIS is a very splendid reprint of a Commentary on the Bible, which has long been in some degree of repute among the Dissenters. Though, if we remember right, there was a good deal of difficulty in disposing of the edition published some years ago by Dr. Raffles. Perhaps the typographical beauty of this edition (for it is singularly beautiful as to printing, though we cannot admire the taste of the decorations, and are old-fashioned enough to prefer the vermilion, to the carmine tint, for the rubric, if our dissenting friends will allow us so to call it) may render it more successful. The cover informs us, that it is "dedicated to her most gracious Majesty Queen Victoria," and it contains what is, we presume, a portrait of her Majesty in a small medallion. To us, who consider this as the oddest and most observable thing about the work, it would have been more satisfactory if it had been said whether it was dedicated *with* or *without* permission; and, if the former, with what degree of explanation that permission was sought.

*The Lives of Dr. John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert, and Dr. Robert Sanderson.* By Izaak Walton. A new Edition, with Illustrative Notes and Plates. Washbourne. 1838. 8vo. pp. 424.

As to the work itself, any remark would be superfluous; as to this edition, it seems to us to be singularly beautiful, and to do great credit to the publisher.

The embellishments are numerous and interesting.

*A Brief History of Church Rates, proving the liability of a Parish to them to be a Common Law liability; including a Reply to the Statements on that Subject in Sir John Campbell's Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Stanley, on the Law of Church Rates.* By the Rev. William Goode, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Rector of St. Antholin, London. Hatchard. 1838. 8vo. pp. 76.

WE are not quite sure whether law, or common sense, or argument, go for anything on this subject. If they should ever have their turn in the discussion of this question, Mr. Goode's little work will be found very valuable. As it is, however, without any very sanguine expectation of such a state of things, and also without professing to be lawyers enough to vouch for minutiae in such matters (though we know of no reason for the least doubt of accuracy), we strongly recommend the work to our readers.

*Church Commission. Memorials and Communications from the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales: with an Appendix, relative to the Bishopric of Sodor and Man.* Reprinted from Returns made to the Hon. the House of Commons, March 16, 1837, and ordered to be printed, April 14, and May 22. Rivingtons. 1838. 8vo. pp. 176.

WE mention this work merely that our readers may know where to find these valuable and important documents, collected and arranged in a convenient form, and rendered still more convenient by an Index. They are not only in themselves a very interesting fact in the Church History of England, but they contain a vast deal of very curious information, which will be gratifying to students of that history, independent of the circumstances by which they have been elicited.

*An Inquiry into the Nature and Prospects of the Adamite Race, as viewed in connection with the Scheme of Christianity.* Whittaker. 1838.

WE are at a loss to imagine why this book should have been sent to us. We must have written a great deal in vain, if we are supposed to believe, with the author, "that the benevolent Creator views the variety of creeds which are established among his creatures with complacency and tenderness."—p. 182. We notice it, however, because it is always worth while to observe that those who wish to get rid of the doctrines, are generally obliged to begin by getting rid of the facts, and the letter, of Scripture. Of course, all that we read about the temptation and fall of man is merely figurative. Everything in the Garden of Eden, (except the literal man—in defiance of Bishop Horsley,) and even the Garden of Eden itself, is mere figure. "But, if we regard the words 'tree of life' as a figurative mode of speech, used to denote Christ's covenant of salvation, or some visible symbol by which that covenant was represented; and, if we regard the word *eat*, as applied to that 'tree,' merely as a figurative expression also, implying the *partaking of*, or *acquiring*, or *attaining to*, that eternal life which is imparted through Christ, (which is the sense in which St. John employs the word *eat* as applied to 'the tree of life,' of which he speaks, and which appears to be the only *rational* sense in which the word can be under-

stood as so applied in Genesis also); then, must we infer, that the words 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil' are used figuratively also, to express some representation of that 'knowledge,' which was fatal to the attainment of eternal life, of that 'knowledge,' the possession of which involved the loss, or the non-attainment, of that eternal life which was purchased by the sacrifice of Christ; and, that the word 'eat,' as applied to that 'tree of knowledge,' is also figuratively used, to express the acquisition, or reception, of that 'knowledge.'"—p. 63. A very *rational* way of interpreting Scripture certainly—and for every species of fanaticism or heresy, very convenient.

*Isle of Man and Diocese of Sodor and Man. Ancient and authentic Records and Documents relating to the Civil and Ecclesiastical History of that Island.* Collected and arranged by the Rev. William Percival Ward, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man. Rivingtons. 1837. 8vo. pp. 186:

THIS little work does not require our recommendation, for, under present circumstances, the subject is enough to secure attention to every publication which relates to it. We must, however, thank Mr. Ward, not only for having collected so many interesting and valuable documents, and so much historical information, but for having given them to us in so pleasing, and, at the same time, so cheap a form.

*The Lord Bishop of Ripon's Cobwebs to catch Calvinists; being a few Remarks on his Lordship's Questions to Candidates, at his late Ordination at Ripon.* By a Clergyman of the Diocese. Simpkin and Marshall. 1838. 8vo. pp. 23.

WE have told our readers all that we know of this pamphlet by the mere act of giving them the title-page, which appeared to us so disgusting, that we did not look further into it. We presume, that the writer is some aggrieved Calvinist, who has been caught; but whether this is the case—or whether it is a gratuitous effusion of party—the writer ought to know, that the mere office of a bishop entitles him to be treated as a gentleman, even by those who are not gentlemen themselves. We say nothing, for we really know nothing, about the circumstances which have given rise to the pamphlet, and we are in no wise engaged to defend the conduct of the Bishop of Ripon, or any other bishop, in this, or in any other matter; but, be the bishop's conduct what it may, it cannot authorize any of his inferior clergy to show him up to the public, under the figure of a loathsome and despicable creeping thing, employed in spreading snares for the destruction of his brethren. Such humour should be confined to Sunday newspapers, and the other popular organs of a Mar-prelate age; and if ever it is taken up by the clergy, it ought to be met with unqualified disgust, and received as an avowal, that the cause in which it is employed is identified with the lowest radicalism. We do not know whether the title-page (for we are speaking of that only) is more or less discreditable for being anonymous.

# INDEX

OF THE

## REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

### CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, AND ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

#### A.

- Additional Curates' Fund*, observations on its application, 247.  
*Affairs of Rome*, by M. F. de la Mennais, 261.  
*America*, condition of society in, 359—state of religion there, *ib.*  
*American Protestant Episcopal Church*, its high character, 445.  
*Anabaptists*, extravagant behaviour of, 286, 287.  
*Aristotle*, an observation of, on pity, 264.  
*Arndt*, the precursor of the Pietists, 103—observations on his "True Christianity," *ib.*  
*Association*, principles of, its influence, 453.  
*Australia*, proceedings with reference to its spiritual interests, 253.  
*Authorized Translation* of the New Testament, its great excellence, 37.

#### B.

- Babbage* (Charles), *Bridgewater Treatise*, animadversions upon it, 88, 89—observations on his line of argument, 91—examples of his style, 91—93.  
*Benedictines*, the, their services to the Romish Church, 78—established the Inquisition, 79.  
*Bentley* (Richard), his able defence of the integrity of the Greek Text of the New Testament, in his *Phileleutherus Lip-siensis*, 4, *note*.  
*Bible*, authorized translation of, its great excellence, 37, 38.

VOL. XXII.

- Biblical criticism*, advances of, in the present times, 2—qualifications of a sound biblical critic, 6.  
*Bickersteth* (Rev. E.), observations on his preface to *Guerike's Life of Augustus Herman Franké*, 94, 95—tendency of his creed towards formalism, 105—remarks on his animadversions upon certain publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 105—107—remarks on his views respecting "good works," *ib.*—and on human corruption, 112—his indiscreet observations in his "introductory remarks" to *The English Martyrology*, 258.  
*Bourbons*, legislative patronage extended by them to the Church, 264, 265.  
*Bowdler* (Mrs.), *Essay* on the proper employment of Time, Talents, &c. 38—modest pretensions and useful character of her writings, 50.  
*Bull* (Bishop), anecdote of, 332, *note*.

#### C.

- Calixtus*, accused by the Lutherans of secretly favouring the Romanists, 104.  
*Cambridge*, historical account of the university and its colleges, 397—suggested reform of, 427—450—state of the university in the time of Elizabeth, 430—statutes of the university, 431—Mr. Walsh's description of the "Senate," "the caput and their veto," &c. 433—his contrast of the tutorial and professional systems, 435, 436—the duty of "lecturing," 437.  
*Centralization*, application of the principle to state education, 471.

M M

*Chandler* (Rev. J.), Hymns of the Primitive Church, 117—account of the circumstances which led him to make the collection, 120—defects of the publication, 124.

*Channing* (Dr.), his self-contradictory remarks on the nature of Christianity, 367, 368.

*Charlotte Elizabeth*, character and tendency of her writings, 50.

*Christ*, remarks on his mode of teaching, 149, 150.

*Christian Church*, as contradistinguished from Popery and Puritanism, 381—her privileges, 396—not the creature of the state, 468.

*Christian unity*, its importance, 439.

*Christianity*, its influence on society, 235.

*Chrysostom*, (St.), his interpretation of Acts, xxvi. 28..22—his high character as an interpreter, 25.

*Church of England*, nature of the tradition sanctioned by her, 242.

*Church of England Gazette*, prospectus of it, animadversions on, 494.

*Church rates*, their antiquity, 215—distinction between the repair of *conventual* and of *parochial* churches, 216, 217.

*Church Establishments*, vindication of them, 218—Church and Establishment not convertible terms, 224, 226, 229—not real peace for the Church, but in the truth, 230.

*Church and State*, on the alliance between them, 219, 220.

*Churton* (Rev. E.), *The Church of England a Witness and a Keeper of the Catholic Tradition*, 242.

*Classical Literature*, revival of, in the reign of Henry VIII. 290, 291.

*Clergy-Aid Society*, observations on its proceedings, 247, 248—its object, *ib.*

*Clergy*, parochial, their duty in the present crisis, 220.

*Colet* (Dean), encouraged by Henry VIII. 288.

*Colonies*, English, their origin, 463.

*Combinative system*, considered, 488—493.

*Conversion of the world*, Christian unity necessary for it, 439.

*Crothwaite* (Rev. J. C.), *Sermon on the Christian Ministry*, 394, *note*.

*Curates*, additional, for populous places, society for supplying, remarks on, 247—250.

*Cotteridge* (S. T.), recollections of, by J. Cottle. Letter from, respecting his habit of taking opium, and its unhappy effects, 257.

*Conservatism*, best mode of promoting the cause of, 251.

*Constance*, Council of, decree of, respecting the denial of the cup in the Eucharist to the laity, 130.

*Criticism*, biblical, difficulty and importance of, 6.

## D.

*Day*, ancient divisions of, for devotional purposes, 121.

*Democracy*, its mischievous tendency, political and moral, 359.

*"Dies iræ,"* &c. excellence of this ancient hymn, 124, and *note*.

*Dissenters*, their exclusion from the University of Oxford, 191—debate in the House of Lords on the question, in 1834, 194, 195.

*Dogmas*, their various kinds defined, 113.

## E.

*Ecclesiology*, importance of the science, 482.

*Ecclesiastical Condition of the Kingdom*, considered, 475.

*Edinburgh Review*, attack of, on the English Universities, 169, 397—especially on Oxford, *ib.*—exposure of the Review, 175, 176—rejoinder, 178—on the exclusion of Dissenters, 191.

*Education*, its real character, 193, 458, 459—necessity of combining religion with it, 460, 461.

*Education, National*, its growing importance, 446, 454, 455, 459—not a party measure, 446, 447, 461, 473.

*England*, vast extent of her dominion, 442.

*English Version of the New Testament*, no standard Greek Text for the original of, 1—its great excellence, 37, 38.

*English Martyrology*, by Charlotte Elizabeth, remarks on, 258.

*Episcopal Church* (Protestant), in America, its high character, 445.

*Episcopal Church* in Scotland, persecution of, 443, and *note*.

*Erasmus*, his editions of the Greek Testament, 1—advances of Biblical Criticism since his time, 2.

*Erastianism*, its nature and tendency, 236.

*Eucharist*, decrees of Councils concerning it, 130, 131—bearing of John, vi. upon the subject, 131, 149—Protestant and Popish views of the nature of the rite compared, 152, 153.



*Evangelical School*, English, remarks on its character and tendency, 96—99—105—113.

## F.

*Faith*, property of it, 148.

*Faith and Works*, observations on, 106, 107.

*Female Religion of the Day*, observations on, 38, 51—its important influence upon society, 54, 61—evils to be guarded against, with reference to it, 55—"erotic" expressions, with reference to the Redeemer, censured, 56—observations on their religious activities, 56, 57—religious dogmatism censured, 58.

*Franké* (Augustus Herman), his *Life* by Guerike, 94—translates two of Molino's works, 95.

## G.

*Gallican Church*, actual condition of, 262—its treatment by the state, 264, 265—accounted for, 265—Council of Paris, 1682, 266—enslaved not by Infidelity, but by Gallicanism, *ib.*

*German Universities* in the middle ages, 206—effect of the Reformation upon the clergy, 207.

*Gibbon* (Edward), extract from his history illustrative of the behaviour of the Roman Pontiffs in the tenth century, 271.

*Greek Text of the New Testament*, no standard one for the original of our English Version, 1—the *Textus Receptus*, *ib.*—Erasmus' First Edition, *ib.*—extravagant assertion of Archbishop Newcome, *ib.*—modern advances in Greek Biblical criticism, *ib.*—marvellous integrity of the Greek Text, 2, 3—difficulty of an improved translation, 13.

*Gresley's* "Ecclesiastes Anglicanus," recommended, 331.

*Griffith's* Christian Church, 383—observations on the general idea of it, *ib.*—inaccuracy of his reasoning, 385—his view of the authority of the Church in matters of faith, 386—his remarks on the 20th and 21st Articles, 390, 391—his erroneous conceptions of the Church, 394.

*Grocyn* (William), the first Englishman who taught Greek at Oxford, 291.

*Gurney* (Joseph John), specimen of his poetry, from "Sabbatical Verses," 256.

## H.

*Hale* (Rev. W. H.), on the Antiquity of Church-rates, 215—his triumphant discomfiture of the arguments of "a Lay Member of the Church of England, 217.

*Hampden* (R. D.), Dr., Introduction to the Second Edition of his Bampton Lectures for 1832..163—extracts from it, 164, 165—observations on the connection between the doctrinal and historical truths of Christianity, 166—want of precision in his language, *ib.*—danger of this, 167—beneficial results from the controversy, 167.

*Hare* (Rev. Augustus William), Sermons to a Country Congregation, character of them, 311, 312, 357—extracts, 317, 320, 329, 348—356—advice to imitators of his style, 357, 358.

*Heber* (Bishop), Sermons on the Lessons, &c., their excellence, 309, 310—extracts, 315, 317, 322, 325, 334—347.

*Hebrews*, ix. 15, 16, 17, interpretation of the passage discussed, 10—12.

*Henry VIII.*, his conduct at the commencement of the Reformation, 287, 288—his encouragement of Colet, 288—and of learned men generally, 290—the people disposed for reformation, before Henry's quarrel with the Pope, 294—destined by his father for the Church, *ib.*—case of the divorce, 299—301.

*Hereditary local clergy*, Bishop Jebb's observations on, 309, *note*.

*Herbert's* Country Parson, quotations from, 331, and *note*.

*Hook* (Rev. W. F.), Sermons in Vindication of Church Establishments, 218—their excellency, 229, 230—on the Establishment of the Church of England, 233—on the influence of Christianity on Society, 235—his style of preaching, 238.

*Holden* (Rev. George), on Church Establishments, 219—his argument injudiciously framed, 221—erroneous notion of Church Establishments, 222—general remarks on the nature of the Church, 224—his over-anxiety to uphold the theory of an alliance, *ib.*—contrasts the opinions of the former and later non-conformists, 225—on the establishment of the Church by Constantine, 227, 228.

*Hymns* of the Primitive Church, 117—want of an authorized collection in the Established Church, 117, 118—difficulty of supplying one, 118, 119—in-

expediency of confiding such a task to any society, 119.

## I.

*Inquisition*, the, establishment of the Benedictines, 79.

*Interpretation* of the dead languages, difficulty of it, 5.

*Irons* (Rev. W.), Parochial Lectures on the Holy Catholic Church, 395—extracts from them, *ib.*

## J.

*Jarvis* (S. F.), D.D., Sermon on Christian Unity, 439—extracts from it, 439—442—observations on the extent of the British dominion, 442, 443.

*Jebb* (Bishop), remarks on an hereditary local clergy, 309, *note*.

*Jesuits*, brief account of the origin of the Order, 63—72—no faithful and impartial account of them yet written, 63—have not greatly served the interests of the Romish Church, 64—its sudden arrival at maturity, 76—circumstances to which it owes its origin, 81—names of Loyola's first proselytes, 67—they obtain the assent of the Pope, 70—their rapid progress in Portugal, *ib.*—they choose Loyola for their chief, 71—their difficulties, *ib.*—object of the society, 72, 84—pliancy of their behaviour, *ib.*—principal features of their statutes, *ib.*—noviciates, approved scholars, spiritual and temporal coadjutors, and professors of the four vows, 73—extensive powers and acquaintance with their proceedings possessed by the Superior General, *ib.*—Layneze introduces the society into the Castilian states, 75—sent by the Pope, with Salmeron, to the Council of Trent, *ib.*—their behaviour there, *ib.*—policy of the vow of obedience, 83—ambitious and intriguing character of the Jesuits, 85—conduct in England and France, 86 successfully cultivate literature and the sciences, *ib.*—their deficiencies, *ib.*—surpassed in authorship by the *solitaires* of Port Royal, *ib.*—surpassed by the Protestant clergy, 87—why? *ib.*—observations on their policy, *ib.*—exposure by Pascal, *ib.* *note*—cause of their being tolerated at present, 88—unsuited to the present exigencies of the Papacy, 273.

*John*, vi. bearing of this chapter upon the Eucharist, 131—157.

*Judas Iscariot's* death, observations on the mode of, 30, 31.

## K.

*Keble* (Rev. J.), Primitive Tradition recognized in Holy Scripture, 235—observations on the duty of the Church, 235, 236, 242—soundness of his views with respect to tradition, 243.

*Keith* (Bishop), his "History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland," importance of the compilation, 285.

*Kings* to be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers, to the Church, in what sense? 237.

*Knowledge*, the associate of Religion, 454—458.

## L.

*Languages*, indefinite mutability of, 5.

*Lateran Council*, the Fourth, the doctrine of Transubstantiation established by it, 130.

*Latinisms*, in the New Testament, examples of, 31.

*Lawrence* (St.), cause of his martyrdom, 270.

*Linacre* (Thomas), promotes the revival of classical literature in England, 291.

*Literature*, its diffusion favourable to the progress of the Reformation, 301.

*Loyola* (Ignatius de), brief account of him, 63—70—means employed by him for making converts, 67—his death, 76, 77.

*Luther* (Martin), his heroical conduct, 80, 81.

*Lutheranism*, its character and creed, 96, 97—lamentable decay of scriptural study in the seventeenth century, 100, —102—strict Lutheranism proscribed in Prussia, 114.

## M.

*Macculloch* (Dr.), "Proofs and Illustrations of the Attributes of God," the work recommended, 93.

*Mant* (Bishop), Hymns, Ancient and Original, 117, 125—excellence of his version of Ancient Hymns, 125—specimens of his original compositions, 126, 127—extract from the preface to his "Ancient Hymns," 128, 129.

*Marriage*, observations on the new laws respecting, 372, 376.

*Marsh* (Bishop), his opinion respecting the date and value of the Vatican MS. 7.

*Martineau* (Harriet), "Society in America," mischievous tendency of her statements, 359—her remarks on self-government in religion, 360—absurdly assigns exclusive value to "sentiment" in religion, 361, 362—her statement disproved, 363, 364—her statement "that the Christian religion is the root of all democracy," examined, 365—367—her false statement, that Christianity, as a matter of knowledge, is progressive, 367—mischievous notions on religious education, 369—on the non-participation of women in political rights, 370—her strictures upon marriage, 371.

*Mennais* (M. de la), account of the actual condition of the Roman Communion, 262—occasion of his first appearance as an ecclesiastical writer, 266—evils traced by him to the temporal establishment of Popery, 267—his theory of the true position of the Papacy, 268—extract, 271, 272—his views as to the present policy of the Romish Church, 273, 276—his error with respect to this point, 274—he establishes the periodical, *L'Avenir*, 277, 278—object and fortunes of that publication, *ib.*—result of his application to the Pope, with reflections upon it, 280—283.

*Metropolis Churches' Fund*, observations on, 246.

*Ministry*, offences in them, a stumbling-block to Christians, 353.

*Monasteries*, obligations of literature to them, 82, *note*.

*Monk of Cimiés*, (by Mrs. Sherwood), defects of the work, 39.

## N.

*National Education*, its growing importance, 446.

*New Testament*, authorized translation of, its great excellence, 37, 38.

*Nice*, second council of, proposition respecting the Eucharist condemned by it, 130.

*Non-Jurors*, firmness and importance of their testimony to the independence of the Church, 234, 236.

*Norwich* (Bishop of), bearing of his Installation Sermon upon the subject of National Education, 447—extract, 448—observations on schism, *ib.*

## O.

*Oleurius*, discouragement experienced by him and Carpozovius in their public exposition of Scripture, 100, 102.

*Orlandini* (Nicholas), History of the Jesuits, 62. (See *Jesuits*.)

*Osiander*, his character of the writings of Arndt, 103.

*Oxford University*, attack on, by the Edinburgh Review, 169—172—suggested reformation of, 171—observations on the "professorial" and "tutorial" systems, 171—173—on the statutes, 172, 173—legality of the present academical system, 212—the question for the consideration of the legislature stated, 400, 401—testimony to the merits of the University, *ib.*—failure of the charge of illegality, 402—charge of breach of trust, 403—the actual constitution of the University at the time of its incorporation, 406—system of tutorial instruction before the Laudian Code, 413—comparison of it with the professorial system, 417—remarks on the representations of the Edinburgh Review, 421.

## P.

*Paley*, his latitudinarian theory respecting the establishment of the religion of the majority, 240.

*Papacy*, designs of Providence with respect to it inscrutable, 269—its rise to power, *ib.*

*Papal supremacy*, how affected by a proposed emendation of the Greek text of Matth. xvi. 18..22—24.

*Parochial Preaching*, observations on, 307—309, 313—315—"choice of subjects," 318, 326—on subdivisions in a discourse, 327—on winning the affections of the hearers, 330—333.

*Pascal*, his *Les Provincials* caused by the persecution of the establishment of Port Royal by the Jesuits, 87, *note*.

*Pastoral Aid Society*, its injudicious conduct, 253.

*Pellican and Capito* reject the doctrine of the real presence in the sacrament, 294.

*Penn's Critical Revision of the Text and Translation of the English Version of the New Testament*, with Annotations, 5—his Canons of Criticism, *ib.*—his fitness for his task, 7—his passionate veneration for the Vatican MS. *ib.* 17—his interpretation of *διαθήκη*, 8—inter-

- pretation of Hebrews, ix. 15, 16, 17. . 10—12—animadversions upon the form in which his Revision is put forth, 13—suggested emendations of the received Greek text, 14—his proposed interpretation of Mark, xiii. 32. . 14—of Matth. xi. 12. . 16—of Acts, xxvi. 28. . 20, 21—of Matth. xvi. 18. . 22—his proposed restoration of a passage to Matth. xxvii. respecting the piercing of our Saviour's side, 25—tests of Mr. Penn's scholarship, 27—his translation of John, i. 5. . 29—and of Acts, i. 18. . 30—his remarks on the manner of Judas Iscariot's death, 30, 31—his conjectures to be received with caution, 36, 37.
- Philalethes Cantabrigiensis*, observations on Dr. Wiseman's hermeneutical principles, 135—remarks on his hermeneutical canons, *ib.*—ingenuity of them, 139, 140.
- Philology*, progress of, connected in England with the advancement of the Reformation, 293.
- Pietists of Germany*, sprung from the orthodox Lutheran school, 94—history of their rise, 96—terminate in the Rationalists, *ib.*—observations on the nature and tendency of Pietism, *ib.*—whether there is a parallelism of character between them and the modern so-called Evangelicals, 95, 96—tendency of the English Pietists to formalism, 96.
- Private judgment*, nature and limitations of it, 386, 387.
- Propagation of the Gospel*, Society for the, its proceedings, 253.
- Protestant Clergy*, surpass the Jesuits in literature, 87—this accounted for, *ib.*
- Psalmody*, present state of, in the Establishment, 117, 118.
- Pusey (Dr.)*, extracts from his Essay on German Rationalism, 100.
- R.**
- Radnor (Lord)*, his motion in parliament respecting the English Universities, 198, 200.
- Rationalists of Germany*, sprung from the Pietists, 284.
- Raumer (Von)*, account of the Reformation in England, 284.
- Reformation Society*, remarks on its proceedings, 251.
- Reformation*, in England, difficulties of its commencement, 285—proceedings of Dean Colet, 288, 289—influence of learning, 289, 291—its progress attended with less excitement than in other countries, 302.
- Religion and knowledge*, their connection, 454, 458—religious statistics, 475.
- Religious feelings*, too sacred to be made subsidiary to the art of "book-making," 50.
- Repentance*, observations on, 349.
- Roman Catholic Church*, extraordinary proceedings of, with respect to the Eucharist, 131—nature of the tradition sanctioned by her, 242—her tenets and character, 477, 478.
- Rose (Rev. H. J.)*, his opinion respecting the origin of German rationalism, 99.
- S.**
- Sacchini*, continuation of Orlandini's History of the Jesuits. See *Jesuits*.
- Sacred Text*, marvellous integrity of, 2, 3.
- Schism*, its real nature, 448, 449.
- Scriptural interpretation* rendered difficult by lapse of time, 5—necessary qualifications for, 6.
- Selfishness*, its danger, 241.
- Shakspeare*, corruption of his works by copyists and printers, 2.
- Sherwood (Mrs.)*, the Monk of Cimiés, plan and character of the work, 39, 40—animadversions upon it, 40—44, 48, 49, 61, 62.
- Southey*, lines by, published in Brydges's Autobiography, 341, *note*.
- Spener and Franké*, chief luminaries of the school of the Pietists in Germany, 98—tenets of Spener, 101—republishes the work of Tauler, 95—errors charged upon his writings by the University of Wittenberg, 103.
- State*, the, its province with respect to religion, 484.
- State Education*, observations on, 461—468.
- T.**
- Taylor (Jeremy)*, advice on preaching, 328.
- Testament* (*διαθήκη*), import of the term, 8—13.
- "*The violent take it by force*," import of these words, 16.
- Theology*, speculative, difficulty and importance of the study, 58, 59—danger of a superficial acquaintance with it, 241.

*Time*, Essay on the proper Employment of, 38.

*Transubstantiation*, decrees of the fourth Lateran Council and of the Councils of Constance and Basil respecting it, 130—bearing of John, vi. upon the doctrine, 131—157—practical tendency of it, 162.

*Trent*, Council of, proceedings of, respecting the Eucharist, 131.

*Trinity*, review of the principal objections against it, 376.

*Trollope* (Mrs.), "The Abbess," character of, 49—general style of her writings, *ib.*

*Truth*, no union without it, 231—not to be sacrificed to expediency, *ib.*—truth and love, importance of their union, 489.

*Turton* (Thomas, D.D.), his examination of Dr. Wiseman's arguments respecting the Eucharist, 134—ingenuity of the examination, 139, 140—his character of the controversial powers of Dr. Wiseman, 161.

*Tytler* (Patrick Fraser), *Life of Henry the Eighth*, character of the work, 306.

## U.

*Ultra-Protestantism*, its character and tendency, 105—108.

*Universities*, English, attack on them, 169—"domestic" education in them, 193—in what sense "*national*," 194.

## V.

*Vatican MS.* of the Greek Testament, its date and character, 7, 21.

*Vincentius's* *Commonitorium*, its excellence, 241.

*Vogan's* Sermons on the Trinity (Bampton Lectures), character of the work, 377—extracts, 378, 379—defence of the Athanasian Creed, 379.

## W.

*Walsh* (B. D.), *Historical Account of the University of Cambridge*, 429.

*Wellington*, Duke of, his defence of the English Universities, in the House of Lords, 203, 209.

*Whately's* *Logic*, observations of the Edinburgh Review upon it, 188, 189.

*Whewell* (Rev. W.), "*History of the Inductive Sciences*," recommendation of the work, 93—objection to the title, *ib.*

*Wiseman* (Nicholas, D.D.), *Lectures on the Eucharist*, 130—his remarks on the proceedings of the Council of Trent, with respect to the bearing of John, vi. upon the Eucharist, 132—*hermeneutical* canon, 183—application of it, 133—135—inconsistency of his views with the behaviour of the Apostles, 137, 138—examination of his interpretation of John, vi. 138—146—instance of inaccuracy of reasoning, 147—extraordinary misapplication of a maxim of Burke, 148, 149—his strange notion respecting the conceptions of the Jews with reference to John, vi. 153—his examination of the words of the institution, 154—157—his erroneous exposition of the Greek, 158—his misconception of the nature of miraculous agency, 159, 160—his character as a controversial divine, 161.

*Wolsey*, his character, 296.

*Woman*, her influence upon society in the present day, extent and importance of it, 38, 54, 61—constitutionally more prone to religion than men, 51—53—unfit for theological polemics, 58—observations on the religious education of women, 59—nature of their official duties in the primitive Church, 60.

LONDON:  
C. ROWORTH AND SONS, BELL YARD,  
TEMPLE BAR.













